(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)
publicity and gone out *tom—toming*. There is no need for *tom—toming*. We are doing our duty. We have asked the Special Secretary of Reorganisation Department and also the Director of Public Instruction to go ahead with the work. Anyway, we will consider the suggestion of Sri Imam.

12-30 P.M.

Sri K. S. VASAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—May I suggest that as they did on the occasion of the inauguration of the Andhra State, at the time of inauguration of this New State here, the desirability of declaring a general amnesty to some of the prisoners?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow any further discussion. It is left to the Hon'ble Members to meet the concerned authorities and discuss this matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಆರ್. ನಾಯ್ಡು (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ).—ಇನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಧವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಅತಿಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾದ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾಗುವ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿಗೂ ಮೀರಿ ಜನರು ಒಂದುಕಡೆ ಸೇರಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಉದಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಶುಭ ಮುಹೂರ್ತದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನವೆಂಬರ್ ಒಂದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಶುಭ ದಿನವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಜ್ಯೋತಿಷ್ಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You should use this House only for discussing matters which are necessary and which are on the Agenda.

Now further discussion on the Mysore University Bill, 1955.

MYSORE UNIVERSITY BILL 1955

Motion to consider (continued).

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ (ಟಿ. ನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೆಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಾಗವನ್ನಾಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವೆನು. ಈಹೊತ್ತು ನಾನು ಆ ನನ್ನ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನೆನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಎಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಬಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುವವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದೆನು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ನಾನ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಬಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಏರುಪೇರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟಿನವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡೆದು ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ತಗಲುವ ವೆಚ್ಚ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ವರಮಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಡಳಿತ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನೇಕೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಬಾರದು ? ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳ ಮುಂದಿಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೇಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. 37ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ :

> "The accounts of receipts and expenditure of each year ending on 31st March shall, as soon as possible after they are audited, be published in the *Mysore Gazette* together with a statement of cash, assets and liabilities and a statement of endowments and investments. Copies thereof shall, together with copies of the audit report, be placed before the Senate at its ordinary meeting and submitted to the Government."

ಇನ್ನು 38ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರದಿಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯ ವರಮಾನ, ವೆಚ್ಚ ಅದರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳ ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ವರಮಾನವೆಷ್ಟು ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಂಶಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದು ಅದರ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಶಾಸನವಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಲು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಬಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿನ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಏರುಪೇರುಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅದರ ಅನ್ವಯ ಅಥವಾ ಅನನ್ವಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯಕೂಡ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಂತೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಾವು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಈ 37ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ

ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಚಾರವೊಂದಿರುತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಪದವೀಧರರಿಗೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿದೆ. ಇದರ ವಿಷಯ ಹೀಗಿದೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೊಬ್ಬ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ ಪದವೀಧರನಾದನಂತರ, ಐದು ವರ್ಷದ ಕಾಲಾವಧಿನಂತರ ಆತನು ದಾಖಲಾಗದ ಪದವೀಧರನೆಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ—ಎಂದರೆ ಆತನೊಬ್ಬ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಆದ ಪದವೀಧರನೆಂದು ಹೆಸರುಗಳಿಸುವನು. ಇಂಥ ಪದವೀಧರರಿಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಭಂಡಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಓದಲು ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು. ಅವರು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು . . . .

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯ ಕೆಲವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳಿವೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಜುಯೇಟುಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಚರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ನೇಮವಿದೆ. ಆ ನೇಮದಂತೆ ಅವರು ಆರು ಜನರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಪ್ರಪೋರ್ಷನಲ್ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸಿಂಗಲ್ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರಬಲ್ ಓಟ್ ವಿಧಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಜನರು ಸ್ಪರ್ಧೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆ ಚುನಾವಣಾ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾರು ಮೊದಲು ಆರು ಜನರು ಆರಿಸಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನು ಆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆದ್ದರೆಂದು ಘೋಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ಚುನಾವಣಾ ಉಮೇದುವಾರರ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯವರು ಪ್ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಗೇನಾದರೂ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳು ಖಾಲಿಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಪುನಃ ಈ ಆರು ಜನರ ಕೆಳಗಿದ್ದ ಏಳನೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ಭರ್ತಿಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗಿನ ಶಾಸನದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಖಾಲಿಬಿದ್ದ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ :

> "45 (2) ** Provided further that if a casual vacancy arises in the membership of the Senate to be filled by the Registered Graduates of the University, the vacancy shall be filled by the next available candidate after the sixth who polled the next highest number of votes at the last previous general election.** "

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 'after the sixth' ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 'after the ninth' ಎಂದಿರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತುಂಬ ಹುಷಾರಿನಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದೇನೋ consequential amendment ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ? ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಬೇಹುಷಾರಾಗಿ ಏಕೆ ಇದ್ದಿರಿ ? ನಾನೇನೋ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವಿದೆ. ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಆರು ಜನ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಇರುವ ಅವಧಿ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳು. ಈ ವಿಧಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅವಧಿ ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷವೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಒಂದೇ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡುಸಲ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು, ಮೊದಲನೆಸಲ ನಡೆಸಿದ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನೂ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಅವಧಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆವಾಗ ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಅವಧಿ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಕಳೆದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾದರೋ ಆ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಐದು ವರ್ಷವೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಬಹಳ ವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾದ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ Registered Graduates ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರವೂ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದು. Registered Graduates ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನೂ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಅವಧಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೋಲಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಐದು ವರ್ಷ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಾಗವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯದ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಬರಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮತಚಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಟಪಾಲು ಮೂಲಕ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ 45ನೇ ವಿಧಿಯ ಐದನೆಯ ಉಪಕಲಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'Vacancies shall be filled by election at the meetings of the electorates or the bodies concerned' ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವೇನೆಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮತವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪತ್ರ (ballot paper) ವನ್ನೂ ಟಪಾಲು ಮೂಲಕ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ electorates ಒಂದು ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿ ಮತ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.)

ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸೋಜಿಗವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿತು. ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ 46ನೇ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ನಾನೀಗ 46ನೆ ವಿಧಿಯನ್ನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ:

> "46. The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, remove by a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting, the name of any person from the register of graduates, and remove any person from membership of any authority of the University if he has been convicted by a court of law**."

ಮೊದಲನೆ ವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಪದವೀಧರನಾದ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಪದವೀಧರ ಕಾದು, ನಂತರ ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ಶುಲ್ಕವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸೆನೆಟ್‌ನವರು, ಮೂರನೆ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದ ಜನರು ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದು, ಓಟು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರನೆ ಎರಡು ಭಾಗದ ಜನರು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಕಾರಣ? ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಕಾರಣವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. 'Disqualification' ವಿಷಯ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ 'remove' ಎಂದು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಪದವನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಕಡೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಎರಡನೆ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ 'remove' ಎಂಬ ಪದದಿಂದ ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

> "The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, remove by a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting, the name of any person from the register of graduates......" 'remove' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯಕಾರಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಸೆನೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿರುವ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಓಟು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸೆನೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ, ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಸುಮಾರು 60 ಜನರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತು ಹದಿನೈದು ಮಂದಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾದವರು. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಹಾಜರಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ವೋಟು ಮಾಡಿದವರ ಪೈಕಿ ಮೂರನೆ ಎರಡು ಭಾಗದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 20-25 ಜನ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ದಾಖಲಾದ ಪದವೀಧರರ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯ. ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡದೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಜುಯೇಟ್ಸ್ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೊಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಹಳ ಅಪಾಯಕಾರಿಯಾದುದು ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಮುಂಚೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಸರಿಯಾದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾವತ್ತು ಇದು ಶಾಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದುವರೆಗೆ ಕೆಲಸದಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವವರ ಪೆನ್ಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಚ್ಯುಯಿಟಿ ಫಂಡ್ ಏನಿದ್ದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಸುಮಾರು ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ನಾನ್-ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಬಲ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಯಾವತ್ತು ಶಾಸನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದುವರೆಗೆ ನಿವೃತ್ತರಾಗುವ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಎಷ್ಟು, ಪೆನ್ಷನ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈಗ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದೆಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವಾಗ ಈ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ವಿಷಯ ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಅಟಾನಮಸ್ ಬಾಡಿಯೆಂದು ಮಾಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ಲಾಘನೀಯ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕೆಡಮಿಕ್ ಫ್ರೀಡಂ, ಫೈನಾನ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಫ್ರೀಡಂ, ಅಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟಿವ್ ಫ್ರೀಡಂ ಇವು ಮೂರನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು; ಇವು ಮೂರೂ ಸಫಲವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಸಿಟೋರಿಯಲ್ ಪವರ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಸಿಟೋರಿಯಲ್ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಲದು, ಅದು ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to offer some remarks on the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore University Bill, 1955. When

this Bill was introduced in Mysore, I had made some observations regarding some of the clauses of the Bill and I also said that some of the provisions of the Bill were retrograde. The Select Committee after going through the observations made by some of the members during the debate on the Bill, have suggested certain amendments. The most important amendment is the omission of the Chapter dealing with the Social Service Board and that has been omitted rightly. They say:

> "The question of providing for compulsory social service engaged the attention of the Committee for a considerable time. The need for such a provision as well as the difficulties attendant upon, make such social service compulsory, was examined at great length. It was ultimately decided that at present there is no need for establishment of a Social Service Board or for enforcing compulsory and free social service from students of the University. We, accordingly recommend that the Chapter V in its entirety may be deleted and consequential changes made in the Bill."

Under the original Bill, Government had contemplated to provide 12 lakhs of rupees for the Social Service Board. I expected the Select Committee to include this amount of twelve lakhs in the lumpsum grant to be provided to the University. The lumpsum grant that has to be provided to the University is worked out as 45 lakhs 33 thousand being the average amount that has been paid to the University for the last three years. We all know that the activities of the University are increasing. The number of colleges are increasing. In addition to this, we are laying stress on the importance of research and other University matters. When this is the case, it is absolutely necessary that we have to provide more funds to the University. We know the resources of the University at present is very poor. It will take some more time for the University to develop and augment its resources. The amount of 12 lakhs that would have been provided for the Social Service Board should be added on to the lump-sum grant now provided for the University so that the University could have its own existence and continue its activity without any hindrance.

Sir, the Joint Select Committee has proposed certain changes regarding the constitution of the University Bodies such as the Senate, Syndicate and the Acadamic Councils. Originally, the constitution of the Senate was more progressive in the sense that the elected element was more than what has been provided in the present Bill.

1 P.M.

Under the existing Act;

> "The Senate shall consist of—
>
> Class I — *Ex-officio* Members:
>
> (*a*) The Vice-Chancellor and the other members of the Council mentioned in section 14;
>
> (*b*) The Registrar;
>
> (*c*) The Deans of Faculties;
>
> (*d*) The University Professors;
>
> (*e*) The Principals of Constituent Colleges, University First Grade Colleges and Affiliated First Grade Colleges;
>
> Class II — Elected Members:
>
> (*f*) Four Members elected by the Academic Council from among its members;
>
> (*g*) Six Members elected by registered graduates from among themselves;
>
> (*h*) Three Members elected by and from the Mysore Legislative Council by the system of the single transferable vote;
>
> (*i*) Nine Members elected by and from the Mysore Legislative Assembly by the system of the single transferable vote;
>
> Class III — Nominated Members:
>
> (*j*) Other Members nominated by the Chancellor so as to make up along with members in classes I and II, a total membership not exceeding seventy-five."

Class IV — Additional Members: This has been omitted in the present

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

Bill. According to the present Bill, the Senate will be as follows: —

"(a) The Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Syndicate;

(b) Four principals of University colleges and affiliated colleges, other than those who are members of the Syndicate, selected by rotation in accordance with rules made by the Chancellor;

(c) The Deans of Faculties who are not members of the Syndicate;

(d) The Director of Medical Services;

(e) The Director of Agriculture;

(f) The Director of Industries and Commerce; and

(g) The Secretary to Government, Education Department."

The last four persons that have been added as *ex-officio* members of the Senate, is an amendment that has been brought forward by the Select Committee. Dr. C. R. Reddy had made some recommendations for constituting the Senate. He had suggested that some of the Heads of Departments should be made *ex-officio* members of the Senate. Even in Karnatak University some of the important Heads of Departments are made *ex-officio* members of the Senate. I fail to see any reason why the Government or the Select Committee have omitted to include the name of the Chief Engineer to be one of the *ex-officio* member of the Senate. We are already having four Engineering Colleges, two Government and two affiliated, and Engineering is a very important subject in the University and it is playing a very important role in the affairs of the State. I do not know why his name is not included in the list of *ex-officio* members to be on the Senate.

Class II—Elected Members.—It is stated here: "Nine persons elected by the Registered Graduates from among themselves."

Sir, the number of graduates is increasing day by day and by metes and bounds. Though the definition of registered graduates in Mysore under the existing Act and in the Bill is very narrow, in view of the fact that this number is increasing and in view of the fact that we are wedded to the democratic way of life, it is but right that the representation that is given to the registered graduates constituency should have adequate representation on the Senate. While speaking on the Bill I had suggested that the definition of the registered graduates should also undergo a change. In other Universities, specially in Bombay University, as soon as the degree is conferred on a person at Convocation held there, his name is automatically entered in the register of graduates. But, here in the definition it is stated:

"'registered graduate' means a graduate registered under the Mysore University Act, 1916 (Mysore Act V of 1916), the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) or this Act."

Registration of Graduates:

"The Council shall maintain a register in which a graduate of any of the following classes may be entered:—

(a) Graduates who have taken the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science in the Mysore University;

(b) other Mysore University graduates who passed the Bachelor's Degree Examination not less than five years before the date of application; and

(c) Mysoreans by birth or domicile who, having passed a degree examination of a University other than the Mysore University before 1919, have since taken the degree.

2. The fee for registration shall be Rs. 5 for life and shall be paid along with the application for registration."

I therefore urge that this narrow definition of registered graduates, should be given up and a wider definition of registered graduates should be

entered in and every graduate who takes a degree at the convocation, whether B.A. or B.Sc., or M.A. or M.Sc., B.E. or M.B.B.S., should have the right to get himself registered as a registered graduate of the University and if possible without paying any fees for that purpose. If this suggestion of mine is accepted, the Registered Graduates' Constituency will have graduates to the tune of nearly 15 to 20 thousands in Mysore whereas the number is only 4 to 5 thousands. Formerly, when these six persons were elected by the registered graduates' constituency the number was not more than one thousand. I therefore plead that the number that has been suggested by the Select Committee is too inadequate and it must be at least nine.

Sub-clause (*c*): " two persons elected by the Mysore Legislative Council, from among its members."

Even in the former Legislative Council of Mysore before dawn of independence they had a right to send four representatives to the Senate from the then Legislative Council. The former Representative Assembly in Mysore had a right to send eight representatives to the Senate. After the dawn of independence and after the promulgation of the Constitution we ourselves approved an amendment to the effect that the Legislative Council in Mysore shall have a right to send three representatives to the Senate and nine from the Legislative Assembly. Now it does not be fit any member to say what was approved was with refer ence to the Representative Assembly or the old Legislative Council and it does not apply to the present Legislative Assembly or Council. I therefore urge that the number that has been proposed in the present Bill is too inadequate. The present number that is existing under the present Act should be retained.

Regarding Nominated Members :

"Nine persons nominated by the Chancellor of whom not less than two shall be heads of high schools maintained or recognised by the Government."

If a rider or proviso had been added to this clause it would have been safer. Instead of giving a blank cheque to the Government, if a rider or proviso as has been adumbrated in the Karnatak University Act, had been added, it would have been better. In the Karnatak University Act it is stated :

"Ten members nominated on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor by the Chancellor, including distinguished educationists, women and representatives of the linguistic minorities and backward communities and other special interests."

Our past experience has been that whenever this power was given to the Government, many a time they have used it in the interest of their own party men and now of course this power is going to be exercised by the Chancellor which will be on the advice of the Government. It would have been better if this number had been decreased or reduced from nine to four or five and the number to be elected increased.

Meetings of the Senate :

"(1) The Senate shall meet at least twice a year on dates to be fixed by the Vice-Chancellor One of such meetings shall be the annual meeting.

(2) The Vice-Chancellor may also, whenever he thinks fit, convene an extraordinary meeting of the Senate for the transaction of urgent business.

(3) Subject to the conditions prescribed, special meetings shall also be convened by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss matters of urgent importance upon a requisition in writing signed by not less than one-fourth of the members of the Senate".

and the proviso has been rightly omitted.

Coming to the constitution of the Syndicate, the Syndicate is a very important body of the University. It is almost the Government of the University. Whatever the Syndicate

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

does, it does in the name of the University and therefore when we are making the University autonomous we must see that the Syndicate is properly constituted and that elected elements will have a dominant voice in the Syndicate. At present the Syndicate consists of the following members:—

(*a*) The Vice-Chancellor;

(*b*) The Director of Public Instruction;

(*c*) Four Principals of Colleges to be nominated by the Chancellor as follows:—

(*i*) Three from among the Principals of University Colleges;

(*ii*) One from among the Principals of affiliated Colleges;

(*d*) Three persons elected by the Senate from among its members who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any affiliated college;

(*e*) One person elected by the Academic Council from among its members; and

(*f*) Four persons nominated by the Chancellor:

Provided that the election of persons under clauses (*d*) and (*e*) shall be according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote."

Sir, three persons elected from among the members of the Senate, is too inadequate. If this number had been increased to five it would have been better and more of elected representatives would have sat on this important body. In the original Act it is:

"three members elected by the Senate from amongst its members who are not on the staff of constituent or affiliated colleges."

It is surprising why this proviso has not been included in this Bill. Adequate representation is given to the teaching staff on the Syndicate and if we omit in this Bill the proviso that was in the original Act, any member of the Senate irrespective of the fact whether he is on the teaching staff or not will be entitled to contest from the Senate to the Syndicate. And as you know, non-official element or the academic element in the Senate is dominating. It is quite possible that in these elections the non-official element may not have much scope to get into the Syndicate and thereby the voice of the elected element in the Syndicate will be reduced. I therefore urge that the original clause as it was in the existing Act should be incorporated in this Bill.

The constitution of the Academic Council is very progressive. Their powers under the present Bill are more than what they used to enjoy under the existing Act. The Academic Council is the proper body to exercise its jurisdiction over certain matters regarding the syllabus, examinations and other things. So far, their recommendations were only recommendatory and they were not binding. Now under the present Bill, they have got ample powers and their decisions are final.

One objection that I have with regard to the constitution of the Academic Council is that under the existing Act, Senate had the right to send five representatives to the Academic Council. That has been omitted. I do not know why that right has been taken away. It would have been better if the Senate had the right to send five members to the Academic Council. Further Sir, in the Tirupathi University, I understand the heads of Departments, whether they hold the post of professorship, or assistant professorship of any group of subjects, Tamil, Kannada and Telugu, are *ex-officio* Members of the Academic Council. It would have been better if a similar provision had been included in the constitution of the Academic Council under this Bill.

Sir, we know from first of November the State is going to be extended. In the new State we are going to have two Universities. We should see that there should be no conflict between this

University and that University and no unnecessary rivalry. In order to avoid that, if we restrict the jurisdiction of the University, it would be better. In the Karnatak University, they have defined the University area where the present University can exercise its jurisdiction :

"University area" means, the area specified in the Schedule.

The Schedule reads as follows :—

Belgaum District, Dharwar District, Bijapur District, Canara District.

The present jurisdiction of the Karnataka University extends to these four districts and they have also taken power to see that if any areas were willing to come under the jurisdiction of Karnataka University, in consultation with the Governments concerned with the area may be included in the jurisdiction of the Karnataka University. Under that clause, South Kanara has been I understand included in the jurisdiction of the Karnataka University. So also the parts that are coming to Mysore from Hyderabad may be included under the Karnataka University. The present State of Mysore including Coorg may come under the jurisdiction of the Mysore University. So I would urge that the Minister in charge would incorporate the definition of the University area in this Bill, and that when the time comes, suitable amendments may be made. I am urging this because as I was a student of the Bombay University, the Karnataka University was not in existence at that time —we were all members of the registered graduates constituency of the Bombay University. After the establishment of the Karnataka University when I applied to the University of Karnataka, to enrol me as a registered graduate of the Karnataka University, they refused to enrol me as a Member under the plea that I did not reside in the University—area as defined by the University Act of Karnataka. So it would be better if we also restrict the jurisdiction of the University. If we do not restrict the jurisdiction of the University area and define its jurisdiction, it is quite possible that the graduates from other areas might enrol themselves as Members of the Registered Graduates Constituency of the University of Mysore. The University will have to experience a good deal of difficulty in conducting elections. So also, the University of Karnataka will experience some difficulty. Now that they have got this definition they do not feel this difficulty at all. Even if I want to be a member of the University Registered Graduates Constituency of the Karnataka University, I will not be entitled as they have defined the jurisdiction of the Karnataka University. Hence, the urgency and the need for the Hon'ble Minister in charge of this Bill to define the University area and the jurisdiction over which the present University of Mysore will have its jurisdiction.

Sir, certain transitory provisions have been included in the present Bill.

> "59. *First set of authorities—Commencement of functions.*—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 9, the first Vice-Chancellor shall be appointed by the Chancellor on a salary to be fixed by him for such period not exceeding three years and on such conditions as the Chancellor may determine.
>
> (2) It shall be the duty of the first Vice-Chancellor to make arrangements for constituting the Senate, the Syndicate and the Academic Council within six months after the date of his appointment or such longer period not exceeding one year as the Chancellor may by order direct.
>
> (3) It shall be the duty of the first Vice-Chancellor, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, to frame such statutes, Ordinances and Regulations, as may be necessary in order to give effect to the provisions of this Act and to publish them in the *Mysore Gazette*, and to carry on the affairs of the University until the authorities constituted under sub-section (2) begin to exercise their functions under sub-section (4). The first Vice-Chancellor shall place such

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

statutes, Ordinances and Regulations, before the respective authorities for such amendments as they may deem fit and necessary to make.

(4) The authorities constituted under sub-section (2) shall commence to exercise their functions on such date or dates as the Chancellor may, by order direct.

(5) Until, the authorities of the University are constituted under sub-section (2), the Vice-Chancellor shall, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, have power—

(i) to appoint such advisory committees as he may think fit; and

(ii) to appoint such clerical and office staff as may be necessary."

Sir, after the coming into force of this Act, it will require some time for the Vice-Chancellor to constitute the concerned bodies in the University. The time that has been given to the Vice-Chancellor to constitute these bodies is one year. Till such time that these bodies are constituted, the Vice-Chancellor will be the monarch of the University. The wide powers that are given to the Vice-Chancellor make us apprehend that the position in the University may not be very safe. In order to allay the fears it would be better if a clause is introduced to the effect that the present bodies of the University, the Senate, the Syndicate or the University Council and the Academic Council will be allowed to function as legally constituted under the Act till these bodies are constituted under the Act. As soon as this Act comes into force, all the existing bodies will be deemed to have been dissolved according to section 62 which reads as follows :—

"62 : *Repeal and savings.*—As from the date of commencement of this Act, the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) shall stand repealed and the Vice-Chancellor, the Members of the Senate, the Members of the University Council, the Members of the Academic Council, the Members of the Faculties and the Members of such other authorities or bodies as were constituted and incorporated by or under the said Act shall cease to function as such :"

I therefore urge, Sir, that a saving clause should be introduced whereby the existing bodies of the University will continue to function till such time as the bodies under the new Act are constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.

1-30 P.M.

A salutary principle has been introduced under the Bill that the powers of the Senate or the University Council under the existing Act have been curtailed and a new body is going to be appointed to make appointments. A new body is going to be constituted under the name of the Board of Appointments and they will have to work according to certain rules to be framed by the Chancellor in consultation with the Syndicate. Under the original Bill the rules to be framed by the Chancellor should be framed in consultation with the Syndicate and the Public Service Commission. I do not know why the Select Committee has deleted that particular portion which refers to Public Service Commission. It is absolutely necessary at the present stage that the rules to be framed by the Chancellor should be framed in consultation with the Syndicate and the Public Service Commission and then only justice for all sections of people will be available.

Regarding the allocation of service personnel, I had stated while speaking on this Bill that the rules to be framed should also be done in consultation with the Public Service Commission. The Select Committee has not thought it fit to make that provision in this Bill.

Then, Sir, we have had experience of the standards of the University having deteriorated. It is mainly due to the staff that is working in the University. An important person was

telling me this morning that in one of the colleges an essay written by a student was much better than the essay which was corrected by a teacher. That has to be remedied. The lot of teaching staff in the University has to be improved. The salaries that are being paid to the University staff are the lowest and what little improvement that was recommended by the Reforms Committee in this behalf was not given effect to, let alone the standards that are suggested by the University Grants Commission. I charge the Government for failure to implement the recommendations made by the University Grants Commission and this failure deserves not to be excused. I hope Government will give earnest consideration to see that the standards fixed by the Commission with regard to pay and other things are given at an earliest date.

*Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajapet).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, my predecessors have spoken on this report at great length and I do not propose to take much time in going through it in detail. Sir, we must all congratulate the members of the Joint Select Committee for having presented this report so soon. In fact, we did not expect that this report would be placed before the House in this session. They should also be congratulated for the many radical changes made in the Bill.

Sir, when I was a student of the Central College, I was the Secretary of the University Union at Bangalore. My friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy also knows how we students were stressing the setting up of an autonomous body. I am very happy that now, when I am a member of this august House, the dream has been realised.

Sir, the University Grants Commission have awarded some funds to the Universities. But I was astonished to find the amount with regard to Mysore University was so low. I made enquiries with the University authorities whether there was any step motherly attitude towards our University. I was informed that because this University was not an autonomous body grants were refused. At least now the University is going to be made autonomous and Government ought to be congratulated for this.

Sir, though the Select Committee has made several radical changes. I feel that the matter of appointment of the Vice-Chancellor should also have been changed. In the other Universities like Madras and others, the Vice-Chancellor is elected. I wish the same thing should have been done here also. I hope this lacuna would be remedied as early as possible.

With regard to the Board of Appointment many members have already spoken. We have been hearing for some years past that appointments in the University are not very regular. The other day one of the Lecturers of the University who was also my Lecturer in Physics was saying that though he had put in a service of 20 to 22 years, still he remained as a Lecturer, whereas his students had become Assistant Professors and Professors. His students who were taken as Lecturers were promoted as Assistant Professors and he still remained as a Lecturer. Hon'ble Members of this House have several times put questions about this. It is a very sorry state of affair that such things are happening. This Board of Appointment, I am sure, will not give room for this kind of complaint. This clause 26 should have been amended. Here we find the Board of Appointment consists of too many persons. It is a big body. I do not think they could discharge their duty in selecting persons so well. I would suggest a small body like the Public Service Commission. I am sure Hon'ble Members would bring amendment to amend this clause 26.

Then, Sir, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy suggested to fix the jurisdiction of the Karnataka University. I do not think that there is any need or good reason to do so. Any student who desires to go and study there may do so. Why should it be made a water-tight compartment ? A time may come when we can think of combining both the Universities. It is better, no doubt, to have one University for the whole State. Otherwise, in course of time a

(SRI R. ANANTHARAMAN)

separatist tendency may develop. Room should not be given for such things.

Sir, this is a very good report and I hope it would be passed and it becomes an enactment as early as possible.

*Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—Sir, in according my support to the University Bill before us, I wish to make a few observations. This Bill is being introduced at a very important period in the history of the Kannada people. We are going to have a new State with a population of two crores and more. We are having another University in the area which is going to join us. So, we have two Universities functioning for two crores of people. But, it is very necessary that we should have a sort of co-ordination between these two Universities. I do not believe in having the same type of Universities in both the areas. We could specialise something in that area and specialise something in this area. There is scope for expanding technological studies. The University will have to pay much greater attention to the technological side of education than merely to the literary side. We have been hearing every day that we are having this literary lopsidedness. Therefore it is very necessary that at a time of introducing fundamental reforms in our University, the authorities bestow some attention on the future development of this University. Now, Sir, we are having new ideas about this university education. There was a time when people believed in merely increasing the number of colleges, and concentrating only on the number of graduates. Now we have enough number of graduates and also the number of colleges is fairly large. Though we have gained in number, as far as the quality is concerned, I think it is practically uniform. The opinion of the educationists who are competent to speak on this subject is that the standard has fallen awfully low. What is the cause for this ? The students who were eager to have university education were admitted without any process of selection. They were enabled to join whichever colleges they liked. So much so there is rush in every college and more the number of colleges you provide greater the rush. Therefore it is time that the university bestows greater attention on quality.

Already some members have spoken about the recruitment of professors to our colleges. We are now in a period when India has to produce efficient and competent men in her universities who can stand a fair comparison with the products of other universities. Therefore, it is very necessary, as far as university education is concerned, that we think of first-best and not of the second-best as we do in politics. It is suicidal and detrimental to the progress of the nation if the educational authorities of the University do not pay attention to these facts. We must have only first-best teachers and professors and students also. It is not necessary that everyone should enter the portals of the University. It is enough if only those who can justify the expenditure incurred by the University, enter the portals of the University. This House is aware that the Government of India have appointed a Committee to go into the question of recruitment of personnel to the Government services. They have been thinking in terms of recruiting non-university men to the services. We have not before us the conclusions of that Committee, but yet we know which way the wind is blowing. Therefore, it is very necessary that every pie that is spent on education is spent well and wisely and in the best interest of the country.

Sir, this Bill before us is no doubt an improvement upon the original Bill and it is also an improvement over the old University Act. But, they have omitted a very important provision, *viz.*, compulsory social services. Sir, there was some criticism levelled against that provision and about the way in which that idea is to be implemented. But, Sir, I must frankly say that the Select Committee has failed in their duty in tackling that problem. Sir, every University Council report and every education committee report, has been harping upon this aspect of social services by university students. That

idea was also incorporated in the original Bill. But here, in the present Bill, they have stated :

> "The question of providing for compulsory social service engaged the attention of the Committee for a considerable time. The need for such a provision as well as the difficulties attendant upon making such social service compulsory, was examined at great length. It was ultimately decided that at present there is no need for the establishment of a Social Service Board or for enforcing compulsory and free social service from students of the University. We accordingly recommend that Chapter V in its entirety may be deleted and consequential changes made in the Bill."

Such a bold statement like this is not going to convince me. This is a problem which has to be tackled with some earnestness. Social service is really necessary and the students should be provided with opportunities to do social service. I would have been satisfied if this Committee had at least stated there is real need to have social service but it may be conducted as extra-curricular activity and funds may be provided for that purpose. There is need for voluntary service. Therefore even now I request this House to consider this proposal and provide funds for extra-curricular activities on social services. When this provision was made in the original Bill, there was a good deal of commendation outside that the University of Mysore is going to do something wonderful and something new in the line. Now, Sir, I say that the dropping of this provision like hot-potato is not going to bring credit to us. We have to make provision for social services in the University. We may not make it very compulsory and saddle it with unworkable rules ; but let us at least make a provision for it in the Bill.

Another very important thing is the medium of instruction that has to be adopted in the University. Sir, on this occasion with very great pleasure I congratulate the new Vice-Chancellor Sri K. V. Puttappa who firmly stated that the medium of instruction is going to be Kannada in the University. That is the way the universities are developing in India today. We cannot allow our languages to be starved. We have to develop them. Unless a language is employed for greater purposes it is not going to develop. There is nothing inherently lacking in Kannada. Kannada is a good language. I think the genius of Kannada knows there is something very special in it. If we look at the conversation in different parts of the country, you can find some humour in this Kannada language which is not found in any other languages. It is a beautiful language specially the language spoken in Mysore which has a tradition of its own. Sir, the language that is spoken in Mysore is really wonderful. It is full of humour, and full of respect. We have to develop that language. It has been possible for people who live in Mysore to develop a wonderful style in this language because the Maharajas have fostered Kannada language and Sanskrit and have made a happy blend of both the languages. I am also familiar with the language that is spoken in Dharwar and Hubli.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble Member that discussion at this stage will be concentrated only on about clauses that have been changed ? You should not digress too much.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—I respect your suggestion.

I was referring to the subject of making Kannada the medium of instruction in the University and my point is that more funds should be provided for translation work. Translation work is very important and without translating books into Kannada language we are not going to improve the university. Sir, I wish that this Bill in some form or the other incorporates that idea of forming a Translation Bureau in the University. If the University has to develop on the right lines, a translation bureau is very necessary and the

(SRI P. R. RAMAIYA.)

University Bill should incorporate that provision.

I shall also refer to the Board of Appointments. The value and efficiency of the University depends upon its teachers and professors. At the time the Mysore University was started in 1916 care was taken to see that the very best men in India were taken as professors and lecturers. As far as the University is concerned there should be no question of provincialism. University education is universal and we should get the very best men. There should be no narrow provincialism or communalism or any sectarianism in the selection of professors and teachers.

2 P.M.

Sir, with very great respect to the old University authorities and those who were responsible for the appointment of professors and lecturers, I should say that the Mysore University has not done its duty in this respect. Some of the very best men have left this University for lack of encouragement. This is a plain statement of fact, Sir, because the highest principles of education and recruitment were not applied as far as recruitment of professors and teachers of research in this University was concerned. Therefore, Sir, at least without elaborating that point, I wish to say that this Board of Appointments should really be a body which is free from any narrow communalism, sectarianism or any provincialism. Unless this is assured, all the money that we are going to spend,—we are now spending 50 to 60 lakhs,—is not going to be well-spent. Therefore it is very necessary that this Board of Appointments should be really a first-class body and should also choose the best men and the most efficient men.

Sir, there is another point and that is about funds. We are going to have two Universities. The Mysore University is spending in all 50 to 60 lakhs, as far as the Budget of the other University is concerned, I think that University is not so rich. How we are going to harmonise two Universities is another point that has to be considered. That University is suffering from lack of funds. Here we have got enough funds. Are we going to have these bodies incorporated in the same area or are we going to run them on different lines. That is a point for consideration, Sir. Of course, I may not be able to give any concrete suggestion on this occasion. Sri Bheemappa Naik has functioned in the University for a long time and I think he has seen the Karnataka University also. Therefore it is very necessary to bring about a sort of co-ordination between the two bodies in matters of statutes and also in the matters of recruitment of professors and in the matter of admission of students. There should be a certain amount of co-ordination between the two. This point has to be borne in mind and it is not possible for me to incorporate that idea here in this Bill by means of amendments.

Sir, with these observations, I wholeheartedly support the recommendations made by the Select Committee and I wish well of this Bill. I hope this Bill would enable the University to make much greater pogress in the future years so that the Mysore University may really become a premier institution in India, if not in the world.

SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—Mr. Speaker, this Bill was discussed at some length last year during the October Session. A number of observations were made and I am glad to find the Joint Select Committee has taken great pains to incorporate most of them and we see before us a report of that Committee which I am glad to say is really illuminating and my hearty congratulations to them on this.

My friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy, in discussing the constitution of the Senate and the Syndicate went on changing in every line. If permutations and combinations are to be permitted to each member of this House, I am afraid, we would have as many combinations in the strength of the Senate and the Syndicate as there are members here. The Joint Select Committee has, I am sure, with great care and deliberation decided on these numbers and I personally feel that

they have done what is perhaps most reasonable. What I would say is that the University is becoming autonomous. But at the same time, let us not forget that large sums of money are being granted by the Government to the University. Therefore, it is very necessary that some kind of control, if not directly, at least indirectly, has to be kept upon the university to see that it does not go off the rails. It is therefore necessary that both in the Senate and the Syndicate, the Government must have a few nominated members who will perhaps voice the feelings of the Government and will safeguard their interests. We have been seeing—I have been a member of the Senate for some time,—that there is a tendency among some members to go off at a tangent. This state of affairs, if allowed to continue, would perhaps bring the University to grief. Therefore, I must congratulate the Joint Select Committee for increasing the number of members in the Syndicate—nominated element from three to four. Similarly, they have made ample provision for nominating nine members to the Senate by the Chancellor.

There is one more thing on which I must say a few words, namely, the Board of Appointments. There has been some comment made by previous speakers bringing the P.S.C. into the picture. For Heaven's sake, let the P.S.C. be far far away from the University portals. What I would say is this: that the University is an autonomous body consistitg of men who are learned and who can conduct their own affairs. As far as this Board goes, let not the University have in its ranks anybody who is a Government servant or a Government nominee. Give that body the fullest opportunity to run its affairs and I would say that the P.S.C. should be the last body which should have anything to do with appointments in the University. In this clause, I see that there is the Vice-Chancellor who shall be the *ex-officio* Chairman; the Principal, Central College; Principal, Maharaja's College; the Principals of the professional Colleges; the Dean of Faculty, Head of the Department of the subject concerned; and two experts. Sir, in this constitution, let us not forget that the Principal, Maharaja's College; the Principal of the Central College; the Principals of the Professional Colleges are all in some form or other, subordinates to the Vice-Chancellor. In other words, it would mean that the Vice-Chancellor's voice is 'His Master's Voice' to these four persons and their existence therefore on this Board counts for nothing. I would not wish that this state of affairs should be there. Let this body therefore get changed with the Vice-Chancellor as Chairman and two or three experts. The latter need not be men of the University. They may be extraneous men or men from other universities, who are competent to receive applications, to determine as to who are the best men to hold the professorial jobs in the University. This clause as it stands is entirely a departmental affair and I for one Sir, do not feel happy why the Joint Select Committee did not bear this in mind while making this recommendation. In the Indian Institute of Science, where a similar state of affairs exists, for all professorial jobs, an independent body is appointed with the Director of the Institute as the Secretary. This body is given full powers to nominate whomsoever they like. On similar lines, I would suggest in the University, the Vice-Chancellor and three extraneous men or three specialists not necessarily from our University, be appointed for the purpose. If that is done regularly and systematically, the difficulties that my friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy pointed out complaining that standards of the University have gone down deplorably low would be solved and we can be sure that a new era for the University in the enlarged Mysore State will begin. It is high time that when we are discussing this University Bill, we must state categorically that university standards will be maintained. The fair name of University of our days unfortunately does not exist today. Let us who are the authors of this Bill bring back the same glory to the University and in trying to do so, let

(SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS.)

us give the University, a body of men who can not only act independently and honestly, but in the best interests of the University and of the State.

My friend Sri P. R. Ramaiya unfortunately raised the language question. I for one do not know how that question arises, because no reference to the language has been made in this Bill. I can speak for half-an-hour regarding language. I will not go into it. You have said Sir, that it has no bearing on this Bill.

Now I come to the last point, namely, social service in the University. This is one important thing on which I want to give perhaps the highest praise to the Joint Select Committee for dropping it out entirely from the body of this Bill. Last year when I spoke on this Bill, I was one to point out that the insertion of social service like this for one full year without any remuneration would not only be unfair, but unjust, because the student after 16 years of hard study, should spend the 17th year of his student life in social service of the State without any remuneration whatsoever when he is on the threshold of new life, eager to get into various branches of services, that he should be required to render social service under the University,—for me at least was unthinkable. I am glad the clause has been deleted. What I would have personally wished was that every year when the colleges close for vacation, the Select Committee could have suggested that at least for a fortnight, every boy or girl should put in social service for two or three weeks. It would not only give the students a new outlook, but would also provide the students of the University an opportunity of knowing what village life is and what that life in the country means a training which would stand them in good stead when they became citizens of the State and come to occupy really important positions in life.

With these few observations, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity you have given me.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—Sir, I just wanted to say a few words on the dropping of Chapter V of the original Bill by the Joint Select Committee. The dropping of this Chapter which dealt with the Social Service Board does not mean that we do not want the students to have a knowledge of village life and social service. It was considered that social service would be a part of the curricula hereafter in the University education. It is very easy to do. In fact, in several colleges here like the Mt. Carmel College they will have classes for five days and Saturday will be off an day. If Government would think of supplying sufficient funds, it would not be difficult to take the boys to villages and show them what village life is. In summer holidays and other holidays, as Sri Mascarenhas put it, they may do some social work. Nowhere in the world is there a thing like compulsory Social Service for one year and without remuneration. That is why this Chapter was dropped; but the idea of social service is not dropped. The students will have sufficient chance for this just as they have drill classes or just as the Hindustan Seva Dal is doing. This can be made part of the curricula.

A MEMBER.—Does this apply only to boys?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Even girl students. If the institutions take it into their head and do it, there is nothing wrong in giving them that education. Give them proper protection and keep them in proper control; that is all.

So far as the Board of Appointments is concerned, in a way I feel like agreeing with my friend, Sri Mascarenhas. It is true there was that view. But, there was the other view also that for appointments to University it would be better to have the Board with the Vice-Chancellor and two other eminent persons. In any case, these are the concern of the specialists. Supposing an appointment of a Professor of Zoology or Geology has got to be made. Eminent men are needed to make selection after testing the capacity of the person. In fact, the University work will extend and it is necessary to have a permanent Board. This Board

with the assistance of experts or the Professors or Deans who tender advice in the matter of appointment will appoint persons. They would guide this Board just as it is now being done by the Public Service Commission. Supposing an appointment of a Lecturer in Chemistry has got to be made. The Public Service Commission calls for applications and the Head of the Department is invited to give opinion about the efficiency of the applicant. That way, even here a separate Board could be constituted and while making appointments the concerned Head of the Department will be consulted. This is a very welcome suggestion.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I almost heaved a sigh of relief when I got the report of the Joint Select Committee. It is almost a year and a half before we could see the report of the Joint Select Committee. Sir, after the advent of freedom the trend was that the entire educational system should be reorganised. With that end in view, many steps were taken. Even in Mysore, the late Dr. C. R. Reddy was engaged to work out the various stages of reforms in the educational field. He suggested certain reforms in the University education. He had even prepared a Bill and I thought that at least in the year 1952 or 53 we could have enacted the University Bill. But, unfortunately, for one reason or the other, we went on postponing the much needed reform in the University Education.

Sir, the University of Mysore was founded in 1916 and almost 40 years have elapsed before we could give a new shape to it, a new type of University which is entirely autonomous, which is free from the strings of Government control. Dr. C. R. Reddy in his report wanted the University to be autonomous and he suggested certain courses for that. On page 159 of his report it is said :

> " It should not be forgotten that the whole thing has been in the process of scaling down for a longer period than is represented by the life-time of one Government or two or by the office of one individual or two *i.e.*, here is not a case of warring personalities but a case of conflicting ideologies and it is the duty of both the Government of the day and the University to save higher education from the resultant carnage, in their capacity as " the trustees of the highest interest of the Nation." The Government's self-denial here will be its supreme act of statesmanship and the University's courage and worth will be measured by the firmness and confidence with which it meets the challenge."

These are the final words of his. Sir, in giving autonomy to the University we must also think of strengthening the authorities of the University. His remarks on page 160 read thus :

> " The essentials of University administration and work contemplate the following :—
>
> 1. Evolution of policies, educational and financial.
>
> 2. Devising machinery to carry out the policies.
>
> 3. Executing these policies with an inside knowledge of, and innate regard to, the various facts of opinion that went to make up the final picture and with a due regard to the administrative problems in the light of the general conditions prevailing in the University and with perfect loyalty to the University's interests."

Sir, the Joint Select Committee have borne in mind all these factors and have given the necessary shape to the various authorities of the University. In the reorganised University the Senate is the most important body. Dr. C. R. Reddy happens to remark with regard to the constitution of the Senate as follows :—

> " With the retirement of the Government from the field of active management and almost detailed control of the University, the several University authorities

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

will have to occupy radically different positions in the future set-up of the University, sharing the responsibility and control in the several spheres thus set free or left unprovided in a clearly understood manner in a spirit of co-partnership. The Senate, for example, will have to take up the position of the supreme authority in the University constitution left vacant by the withdrawal of Government for University administration. It is significant that under the present Act, the power of the Senate is disposed of in a few lines. Secondly, it will have to lay down well considered policies and by its general rule-making powers define the main lines on which the University's work will have to be done. It will not do anything direct but it will determine how and when most of the things shall be done and, where the Act is silent, whether a particular type of work shall be done by the University, and if so, who shall do it. It will have generally to set the tone and standard of the University. Thirdly, till now it would have been possible for the University authorities to have shied at responsibility and it would have been unnecessary for any of them to act as interpreters of the actions of the University to the public so that the University could be sure of the confidence of the public at large and of the position of its work. That was in fact the duty of the Government for it to exercise or not to exercise as its discretion. But, now that the Government will no longer be able or willing to shoulder the direct responsibility for the University and its administration the Senate as the largest deliberative body in the University will have on the one hand to keep itself in touch with " the movements of public opinion on educational questions " and on the other to keep all the best opinion in Mysore acquainted with the development of University work through its discussions and reports. Fourthly, its responsibilities for the careful use of its financial resources placed at its disposal by the Government or by the public are definite."

Sir, with these ends in view they have made sufficient provisions in this Bill and I would like to congratulate the Joint Select Committee. Sir, in Chapter IV the Joint Select Committee has thought it fit to retain the class of members to the University Senate. Class I—Ex-officio, Class II—Elected Members, Class III—Nominated Members. Sir, with the advent of autonomous University I hope the House would think that it must delete this class distinction; so also in the case of Academic Council.

Then one vital thing which according to me they have omitted is this. In the case of election to the University Senate I want that in this autonomous University the Government servant should not be exposed to the risk of election. I would put it in that indirect manner. We are fully aware of the results of these elections and how elections are fought and won. Therefore in the case of elections to the University Senate from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, I would suggest that it is much better if the employees of the Government University or even Affiliated Colleges are prevented from contesting in these elections. Sufficient provision is made for nominating Principals of the Colleges, Deans of Faculty, Director of Agriculture, Director of Medical Services, Director of Industries and Commerce and the Education Secretary. Therefore Government have sufficient power to nominate all those who ought to be on this body and it is much better that the employees of Government or of the Universities are not allowed a chance to contest during these elections. I need not refer in detail to the way in which these elections are fought and canvassed, paticularly in the Registered Graduates' Constituency.

2-30 P.M.

Moreover we must follow the healthy principle of not allowing the subordinates of the University from getting into the University Senate.

The Syndicate—This is an executive body of the university. Even here we should not expose the Government officials to elections.

The Board of appointments—I am entirely in agreement with my Hon'ble friend, Sri V. M. Mascarenhas, when he said that the Board of Appointments should be as far as possible free from unhealthy influences. He did not want the Public Service Commission. I do not want it to interfere with the selections of either the Professors or Lecturers of the University. What I want is this: that the Board of Appointments should be as far as possible not only autonomous but should be able to exercise authority free from other corrupting influences. Therefore, I have suggested an amendment and that amendment covers what I want to state. But suffice it to say, that the Principals, Deans, Heads of Departments, may be taken as observers by the Board of Appointments whenever particular appointments are made to respective places.

I entirely agree with Sri Mascarenhas that nobody is happier than this House for deleting the clause on Social Services. Several members have stated how harmful it is to the progress of those that have left the portals of the University.

Another vital point I would like to press on the attention of this House is in regard to Chapter X. This has to be recast as the transitory provisions do not agree with the facts. Elections have already been held both from the Registered Graduates' Constituency, from this House as well as from the Legislative Council and the Academic Council. It is not correct to drop them as 'hot potatoes' as my friend, Sri Ramaiya put it. Therefore, what I would suggest is, retain all those persons, under the transitory powers, reconstitute the Senate and Academic Council, if you want a nominated Syndicate for a temporary period of six months. Then hold elections under this Act and reconstitute the whole bodies as contemplated under this Act.

Before I conclude, I would like to say one thing. Now that we are creating an autonomous university, I would make a special appeal to the Education Minister that he should devise some method for co-ordinating the activities of the University and the activities of the secondary and primary education, for education should be a continuous process and cannot be conceived as compartments at different stages. Even Dr. C. R. Reddy has stated very succinctly in his report:

> "The above survey raises the question of co-ordination at the various junction points of Secondary, Technical and University education. While these types of education are distinct entities in themselves for planning and execution, they cannot afford to consider themselves as entirely unconnected with the rest. It is very desirable therefore to create a connecting link among these three types of education so that there will be a common purpose running through all these not so much in the breadth as in the length. We should be very careful at the same time to ensure that such a co-ordination does not overstep the limits afforded by the junction points. It seems desirable to create opportunities from the first instance for close collaboration among the three agencies—the University, the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Technical (including Agriculture) Education..."

With these few words, I support the Bill as reported by the Select Committee.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳೆದ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ಅದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದು ಆ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಜಂಟಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಮಸೂದೆ ಪುನಃ ಸಭೆಯ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ).

ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಮೂಲ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ದಂಥ ಆದರ್ಶ ಉದ್ದೇಶದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಆಶಾಭಾವನೆಯಿತ್ತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ವಾತಾವರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣ ವಾಗಿ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡು—ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಗತಿಪರವಾಗಿರು ವಂತೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಾದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನು ಮೋದಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಸಮಾಧಾನದಿಂದ ಉಸಿರುಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡ ಹಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಏನನ್ನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿ ಸಿದ್ದೆನು ಆದರೆ ಈ ರಾಜಕೀಯವೇ ಬಹಳ ಕುಂದಕ ಸ್ವಭಾವದ್ದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾವೀಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಈ ವಿಳಂಬನೀತಿ ಪ್ರಗತಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಂಟಕಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಮಾತ ನಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾವೀಗ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ದಿಂದ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಅದರ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲೇ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಅಂತು ಅವರ ಆ ಕುತೂಹಲವೇನೋ ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದೇ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಹೀಗೆ ನಾವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೇ ವೆನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರೇನೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ಒಂದು ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಒಂಬತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದಂತೆ ತಡೆಯಿದ್ದ ಗಂಡಾಂತರವಾದರೂ ಏನೆಂ ಬುದೇ ತಿಳಿಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರೇನೂ ಅಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದಂಡೆಯಾತ್ರೆಯನ್ನೇನೂ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಮಗಳೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡ ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ...

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್.—ಈ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಆಟಾನಮಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉದ್ಭವವಾದದ್ದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೋದ ವರ್ಷಮಾತ್ರ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ 9 ವರ್ಷ ಸರಿ ಯಾದ ಟೀಕೆಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಆ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ವಿಷಯ ದಾಟಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಈ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪ್ಯಾರಾಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಭ್ಯಾಸದಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದವರೆಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಏತನ್ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತವೂ ಒಂದು ಕುತೂಹಲವನ್ನೆಬ್ಬಿಸುವಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿ ಯವರೂ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅನಂತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೊಂದು ವರದಿಯನ್ನೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿದರು. ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೂಡ ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿ ಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೂ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಚುಟರಿ ಬೋರ್ಡೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಈಗಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಾ ಣಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಥವಾ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಲ್ಟಿ ಪರ್ಪಸ್ ಹೈಸ್ಕೂಲು ಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member will speak only on such points which have a bearing on this Bill.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಇಂಟಿಗ್ರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೂ ಕೋ-ಆರ್ಡಿನೇಷನ್ನಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಅದೊಂದು ಕಂಟಿ ನ್ಯೂಡ್ ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸೆಕೆಂಡರಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಲು ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಲ್ಟಿಪರ್ಪಸ್ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 22 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದರೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು.

ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾ ನಿಲಯದ ಒಂದು ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಟಾನಮಿ ವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ವೈಸ್‌ಛಾನ್ಸ ಲರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸ ಬೇಕೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾ ಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಈ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ನಡೆ ಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಗೊಂದಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎಡೆಕೊಡಬಹುದು, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮವೆಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನರ ಅಭಿಮತವಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವೈಸ್‌ಛಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರುವ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಗೊಂದಲ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳು ಇರ

ಬಹುದು. ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೀಗಾಗುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ನೇಮಕವಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಬಹುಮತದಿಂದ ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಪಕ್ಷ, ಪಂಗಡ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಾಮಿನೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೂಲ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಭವವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾವು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಶಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಮೂಲ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುತೂಹಲವನ್ನು ಕೆರಳಿಸಿದ್ದ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವೆಂದರೆ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ನೆರವೇರಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದ್ದ ಐದನೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ. ಹಿಂದೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದು ಕಾರ್ಯತಃ ನೆರವೇರಲಾರದೆನ್ನುವ ಅನುಮಾನವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು curriculumನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಸೇವೆ ಅಥವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿಗೆ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಥವಾ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ವಿವರಣೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಮಾಜ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ನೋಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಸಂಘಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಯೂನಿಯನ್, ಅಸೋಸಿಯೇಷನ್, ಸಂಘಗಳು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಘಟನೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಒಂದೊಂದು ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುತ್ತಾ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ತರಗತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನೇರವಾದ ಪರಿಚಯಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ, ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ, ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಎಂದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಳುವಳಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಕರೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿತ್ತು. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಯಾವೊತ್ತೂ ಏನೂ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ (demonstration) ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತ ಬಂತು. ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದಲೇ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬೇಡವೆಂದಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಇದು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು, ಇವೊತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಸಂಘಗಳಿರಬಾರದು, ಅವು ಏನೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೇಶಾದ್ಯಂತ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಯಾವ ಸಂಘವೂ ಜೀವಂತವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಸಂಘಗಳಿದ್ದು, ಅವರು ಸಂಘಟಿತರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಷ್ಕರವನ್ನು ಹೂಡಬೇಕು, ಆಡಳಿತ ವರ್ಗದ ಮೇಲೇರಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸೌಹಾರ್ದ, ಸಂಪರ್ಕ, ಪರಿಚಯಗಳು ಬೆಳೆದು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತರಗತಿಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಒಂದು ವೇದಿಕೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಳವಿರಬೇಕು, ಯೂನಿಯನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಿರಬೇಕು, ಹೊರಗಡೆಯ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಆಂದೋಳನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸಹಾಯಕಾರಿಯಾಗಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಡವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್ ಅವರು ಇರಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೂ, ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ವಿಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕರಣವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವು ಆಟಾನಮಿಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತವೆ. ಆಗ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್‌ರವರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್‌ರವರು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ನಾವು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಇನ್ನು Board of Appointments ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು, rules frame ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನವರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದೇನೂ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ)

ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೀವ್ರ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನವರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕವನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ತೂಕದಿಂದ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಈ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮೀಷನ್. ಇದೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ. ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿ ಸಲವೂ ಇವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ rules frame ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗುವುದೋ ಏನೋ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅನುಮಾನ. ಇದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ Board of Appointments ಬೇರೆ ಹೊಸ ಸ್ಕೇಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲಾರೆ. ಈಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಬೇರೆ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ M. Sc. ಮುಂತಾದ technical knowledge ಪಡೆದವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರುಗಳಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರಾಗಿ ಪ್ರೊಬೇಷನರಾಗಿ, ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಆದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಆಗಬಹುದು, ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಆಗಬಹುದು, ಹೀಗೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕಡೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇವೊತ್ತು recruitment ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಲ್ಕಾ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮಟ್ಟ ದಿನೇ ದಿನೇ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದು ಯಾವೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಿ ಅವೊತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆರಂಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. We have not yet arrested the deterioration that takes place somewhere. ಯಾವೊತ್ತೋ deterioration ಷುರುವಾಯಿತು. ಅದು ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದೆ. ನಾವು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಈಗ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮಟ್ಟ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವವರ ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ (ಮಟ್ಟ) ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ. ಈಗಂತೂ ತೀರ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದೆಲ್ಲ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

3 P.M.

ಅದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಬೇಕು. ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಮಾಲ್ಯುಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಡಮೆ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಬರೀ ಎಮಾಲ್ಯುಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಮಟ್ಟವೆಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮೂರು ಹೊತ್ತೂ ದುಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನಿತ್ತು ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನೂ ಬಗಿಸಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಶೋಚನೀಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ದಿನ ಬಿ. ಎ. (ಆನರ್ಸ್)ಆದವರನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಚರರುಗಳಾಗಿ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಅವರು ಚಿಕ್ಕವಯಸ್ಸಿನವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಕೆಲವು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರನ್ನು ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೀರಿಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳೂ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಸ್ಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ತಜ್ಞರಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿಯೂ ಇರುವ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನೇ ನೇಮಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಫ್ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನವರು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹಾ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಈ ದಿನ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಾಸಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರೇನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದರೋ ನನಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಎನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ I, ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ II, ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ III ಎಂದು ಸೆನೇಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಕೆಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನವರು ಮೊದಲು ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನವರು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾದೀತೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಭಾವನೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬಾರದು. ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. It has no bearing so far as the Council is concerned. ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಐಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್‌ರವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಹಲವಾರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಈಗಿರುವುದರ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಲ್ಕಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಏರಿಯಾ ಡಿಫೈನ್‌ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಿರಬಾರದೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಯಿರುವ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ರಾಜ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಉತ್ತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಅಥವಾ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಜನರಿರುವ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೇ ಭಾಷೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಆಡಳಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಈಗ ಹೊಸರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಶ್ವ

ವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯುಗಳೆರಡೂ ಸೇರಿ ಒಂದು ಏಕೀಕೃತವಾದ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯುವಾಗುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದುದು ಎಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. There can be honest differences of opinion. ಅದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೂಡ ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯುವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 17ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಆಟಾನಮಸ್ ಆಗಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹಣ ಕೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಡುವ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಹಂಚಿದರೆ ಆಯಿತು. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯು ಮಾಡಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ it will not be a burden ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಫ್ರೇಂ ಆಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವಾಗ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಾರೀಖನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯು ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉನ್ನತ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ಆಶಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise and meet at 3-40 P.M.

The House rose for Lunch at Ten Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Forty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.)

*Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY (Malur).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to accord my wholehearted support to the report of the Joint Select Committee that has been placed before us. While doing so I would like to make one or two observations. In section 5 of the Bill, a bifurcation is made between the University colleges and the Government colleges. I do not know whether there was any necessity for such a bifurcation. They have given the list of Univer sity colleges and my inference is they have excluded the other colleges thereby meaning that these colleges that are mentioned specifically here will vest in the University and the rest of the colleges vest in the Government for management and control. Of course even last time when there was a discussion on the Bill, members made suggestions that the other colleges also may be managed and controlled by the University itself. Now they have added one more college, the first Grade College at Tumkur. Barring these few colleges, the other colleges are sought to be managed by the Government. The House will kindly remember that even Dr. C. R. Reddy has made a recommendation in his report on university education that in intermediate Board will have to be instituted for the management of several Intermediate colleges in the State after making the University a three years' course. But, I do not know why no provision has been made in this Bill, either in the original Bill or in the Select Committee Report, about the management of the Intermediate colleges. We are aware that the Education Department of the Government is not in a position to control the several high schools, middle schools and primary schools and run them properly. There are lots of complaints about these educational institutions that are being run by the Education Department. Probably these institutions are too much of a burden for one department for being controlled and managed. The Department is so unwieldy and now if the several Intermediate colleges are not going to be vested in the University but have to be vested for management and control by the Department of Education, I am afraid things will go from bad to worse. The salient recommendation that has been made by Dr. Reddy on university education, *viz.*, that an Intermediate Board may be set up for administering the Intermediate Colleges, has not been taken into consideration and provision made fori t. Therefore, I request the Government either to have the several Intermediate colleges that do not come within the purview of the University according to this Bill to be vested in the University itself or to make suitable

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

provision for the management of several Intermediate colleges and other colleges which do not come within the purview of the University, by providing an Intermediate Colleges Board so that the institutions may be run properly.

Again Sir, we are, by accepting this Bill, narrowing the scope of university education. We have several University institutions in the districts. Now after this Bill comes into operation, we will be confining the university education to a few places and the several districts in the State will be losing the benefit of University atmosphere, and University extension lectures. I therefore strongly urge the Government to make suitable provision in this behalf.

Again, the Government were pleased to state some time back on the floor of this House that First Grade colleges would be opened in several district head quarters. I wish the Government had made provision for opening such colleges in the various districts and included them as the institutions vesting in the University. I hope the Government would not lose time in the establishment of the First Grade colleges at several district headquarters and bring them under the purview of the University for being controlled and managed.

Another omission which the Select Committee has made is the omission of Social Services Board. When the Bill was first introduced provision for the establishment of a Social Service Board was made. Social Service was an important chapter and it enunciated very important principles and when the Bill was referred to the Select Committee it means that the principles enunciated therein have been accepted. I do not know whether the Select Committee was competent to go against the principles that underlie the Bill and I do not know whether they were competent or empowered to give a go-by to the whole chapter and throw the principles that had been accepted, to the winds. My submission is that the Select Committee was not expected to give a go-by to the principles and omit an important point. As several members have referred, the provision for social service had created a storm and stir in the whole of India and several universities were looking forward to the principle being accepted and that the University of Mysore would give a lead in this regard. It is unfortunate that the Select Committee has given a go-by to the entire scheme and they have not even given an alternative regarding the arrangements for purposes of social service being rendered by the students. Social Service is not a new thing. There was in our university what is called social service settlement and even that has been abolished. I remember the government had a scheme wherein certain period of social service had been fixed to be rendered by the students before they left the portals of the University and they were entitled to a degree. Now, when our University has stolen a march over other universities and was about to give a lead, I do not know the justification for giving a go-by to the social services. The reason given by them is that it is not workable and that it would involve many complications and many difficulties and all that. Of course students are freed from difficulties. As several members pointed out it would have been better if the members of the Select Committee or the Government had given a workable scheme of rendering social service, say for a period of three or six months. It would not have mattered if the students rendered service for three or six months and paid something. Even now, when the students go to service camps some amount is paid by the Government towards the cost of the service rendered by the students. Therefore, an arrangement could have been very well made. So, even now I very strongly urge the Government to arrive at a workable scheme of social service and make suitable provision for it. After all we are passing this Bill after waiting for a period of nearly 6 or 7 years and if only we had waited for a month or two more we could have met as members of a New State of Mysore and we could have made provisions for this and we could have taken the opinion of the members coming from the other areas to the Mysore State and enacted the

University Act for the entire State. Having waited for all these years, I do not know where was the hurry to push through this Bill now and giving a go-by to many important provisions of this Bill. I hope the Government will make suitable provisions if not immediately at least later when the other areas come and join Mysore.

Sir, with regard to giving representation to graduates, some of the Hon'ble members were suggesting that the employees in the university and several departments may not be allowed a chance to stand for election. Of course I agree with the view. But, what I want to be done is, when we make provisions for representation being given to graduates, what is done is it is the registered graduates that will have the right to elect nine members that will have to go to the Senate. Now, the registered graduates, we are aware have a right to elect some members to the Legislative Council. Here, by saying that it will be registered graduates that will have the chance to elect nine members, I am afraid we will be depriving innumerable number of graduates other than the registered graduates, the privilege of electing members to the Senate. I urge the Government to allow all the graduates of the University to elect these nine members to the Senate.

With regard to the term of several authorities of the University, the Senate, the Syndicate and the Academic Council, the period fixed in this Bill is only three years. In the Assembly and Council the term is five years. I do not know why the University authorities should have only three years as their term of office. In fact even the Assembly and Council had only three years long ago. Recently they enhanced it to five years.

4 P. M.

I do not know what justification there is for fixing the term of these University authorities only at three years. Many of our friends were suggesting that these elections would involve a good deal of politics and all that. If this is to be avoided, I think it is better that the Government fix the term at five years and not at three years, as in the case of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council.

With regard to the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor, on several occasions the matter was discussed on the floor of the Senate and also of the Assembly and Council and the promise had been made that the matter would be discussed at the time of the reorganisation of the University. Several suggestions were made by the Hon'ble Members last time at the time of the discussion of the Bill that provision may be made for the conferment of the privilege of elected Vice-Chancellor on our University. Now, the Hon'ble Minister for Education was mentioning the other day that the Karnataka University will have the privilege and the pleasure of having an elected Vice-Chancellor, while the Mysore University will have a nominated Vice-Chancellor. I do not know why there should be any difference between the two Universities. We have in several parts of our country, the various universities, a majority, if I may say so, have elected Vice-Chancellors. Here, unfortunately in Mysore, though we have been urging several times that we should have an elected Vice-Chancellor, the suggestion has not been accepted at all. The reason given is that the University would become the hot bed of politics and that it would involve so many things attendant on election and therefore we should not have this privilege. If it is considered necesary to have an elected Vice-Chancellor in the Karnataka University, I do not know why we should not have it here. In fact, we should have a uniform policy. There should be no distinction between the two Universitites in this vital matter. Now that a New Mysore State is being formed, I think it is fair to confer the benefit of elected Vice-Chancellor in regard to both Univerities. We have been seeing what is happening in our University, There is very heavy work. The Vice-Chancellor or other authorities or other persons in charge of the University affairs are not responsible either to the Senate or to the Syndicate or the Academic Council. They are going on in their own way. Supposing

(SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.)

we have an elected Vice-Chancellor he will have the necessary initiative, the necessary drive and he will push through a popular policy and programme. He cannot afford to be irresponsive and irresponsible to the Senate and Academic Council or to the Syndicate. Therefore it is high time that the Government makes up its mind to confer the privilege of elected Vice-Chancellor on our University.

One more thing and I am done. What this Bill lacks in is that no provision has been made for what is called a residential university. We find university education being narrowed down in its scope. They are bifurcating university education from the Intermediate colleges and they are placing the intermediate education in the hands of the Government and only a few colleges are selected for being vested in the University. When they are narrowing the scope of university education, I wish they had provided for a sort of residential education by opening a number of hostels and by allowing students to reside in hostels so that a closer contact between the teachers and the taught may be brought about. It is only then that the standard of our education would increase. There will be first rate students and first rate professors and lecturers. It has been suggested by several friends there is no use in allowing all and sundry to enter the portals of the University. It is the best students that have to be allowed admission into these University. institutions and all the rest of the students who are not fit for university education must be admitted into the diversified courses and they have got to be provided education in the several polytechnical institutions. I am afraid the Members of the Select Committee have lost sight of this important principle and I urge the Government to make suitable provision for it.

With these few words I welcome the Bill.

SRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—If the Chair is willing to give permission, I will speak; if not I do not press.

MR. SPEAKER.—We want to finish the Bill to-day. The Hon'ble Member can speak on the clauses when they are before the House. The Hon'ble Minister will now reply.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I shall be very brief. I welcome the criticisms that have been offered; much of the criticism has been answered by Hon'ble Members themselves. Therefore I confine myself to just a few points.

It was argued that there was necessity for a Board of Intermediate examinations. I believe that the idea has become too old already. The Intermediate course itself has been abolished and three-year degree course has been instituted and one year has been added on to the secondary education and the secondary course now consists of four years. Therefore there was no necessity felt for establishing the Board of Education.

SRI H. C. LINGA REDDY.—May I know what will become of the present Intermediate Colleges?

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have answered it. The Intermediate course of two years will be divided as follows: one year will go to the University and you have the three-year degree course and another year will be added on to the secondary course, the present high school course. As Hon'ble Members may know, 15-year course of education consists of three parts—primary or basic education of eight years, high-school or secondary education of four years and a university or degree course of three years, and this has been accepted all over India as well. Now, Sir, in order to bring about co-ordination of these three educational courses, it has been provided and it has been decided to establish a Central Board of Education in which both the D.P.I. as well as the Vice-Chancellor will be represented. Per contra, in the University Syndicate over which the Vice-Chancellor presides, the D.P.I. also will be a Member. This co-ordination has been sought to be provided for.

Next, Sir, about the Board of social services. The Select Committee has not given up the idea of social service or manual training. Whether it should

be provided in a compulsory or obligatory manner or whether it should be left to the University to provide some kind of extra-curricular activities was the point. It was advised by the various university authorities and the Central Board of Education as well as by the Members of the Select Committee that it should not be of a compulsory nature. Therefore I am sure the University will provide for extra-curricular activities and both social service and manual training will be provided. As a matter of fact, Sir, we have added in the Bill clause 3 (2) wherein the purpose has been clearly defined :

> " 3 (2) The University shall be deemed to be incorporated for the purposes, among others, of making provision for imparting education, literary, scientific, and artistic as well as agricultural, technical, commercial and professional, of furthering original research, of promoting the study of literature, science, art, philosophy, history, medicine and other branches of useful knowledge and of imparting physical and moral training."

This is very comprehensive and it is the duty of the University to implement these purposes for which this legislation has been enacted at present. I am sure that social services and manual training come under " other useful knowledge".

Therefore, Sir, there has not been any departure from the principle on which the University Bill was framed.

Next, Sir, two or three points have been made out. One regarding the Board of Appointment. There is an amendment on that subject and in the course of my reply to the amendment, I will make the position clear. Similarly, regarding the transitory provision, it was argued that both the Academic Council as well as the Senate which have been constituted or about to be constituted should not be dismissed very lightly and that their services may be made use of instead of abolishing them right now and appointing advisory bodies till new bodies like the Senate or the Academic Council are constituted. I feel, Sir, that both common-sense as well as prudence should lead us to a proper consideration of the proposal and when the amendment is moved, I shall answer that point in greater detail.

Lastly, Sir, keeping subordinate Officers of the University in places of power and authority in the various university authorities has been greatly opposed, and in order to achieve that objective, several amendments have been tabled. I believe, Sir, the principle underlying these amendments is worthy of consideration and I shall be again adverting to that. One apprehension may be felt regarding this Board of Appointments of the teaching staff, namely, that the power of appointing should be vested in them and not in any outside body. On that point also, when the amendment is moved, I shall answer.

With these few remarks, I move that the consideration motion be adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

> " That the Mysore University Bill, 1955, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into cosideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clauses. There are no amendments up to clause 15 because the amendments tabled by Sri Srinivasa Iyengar have been withdrawn. The question is :

> " That Clauses 2 to 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 14, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 15. There is an amendment by Sri K. Puttaswamy.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—Sir, I beg to move :

Class II

> " (1) At the end of the item (*a*), the following words, namely, "who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any affiliated College " shall be added.

(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.)

Sir, according to the report of the Joint Select Committee nine members are to be elected from among the Registered Graduates. According to the practice pertaining now, any Registered Graduate can offer himself as a candidate. In our experience we have found that some Judges and several other Officers of the Government or of the University offier themselves as candidates and touring the State for the purpose of election. In the recent election held, a person belonging to Ministerial section of the University office stood as a candidate and was elected. This creates embarrassment in several respects. These officers go out and expose themselves not only to the risk of election but indulge in the election propaganda which is not free from undesirable incidents. Therefore it is much better that the employees of the Government as well as the University and also employees of the Affiliated Colleges are not made eligible for election. By accepting this amendment the spirit behind this Bill will not be taken away. I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

Class II

'(1) At the end of the item (*a*), the following words, namely, "who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any Affiliated College" shall be added.'

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—While agreeing to this principle I want to say one word as to why the Select Committee thought of this proposition. They thought of providing this provision in the University Service Code. It is all the same whether it comes here or there. I accept this amendment.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I would like to know if various amendments that have been tabled by Sri K. Puttaswamy and Sri T. Mariappa are on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the Education Minister or in their own individual capacity. Why I put this question is for this reason. I was a member of the Joint Select Committee, so also Sri K. Pattabhiraman and others. We drafted this report after careful consideration. Now if these amendments are accepted by the Minister in charge of the Bill, I think those that participated in that Select Committee will have to take it a little seriously. It is a matter between the members of the Select Committee and its Chairman who represents Government. Here some amendments are moved by other members who are not members of the Select Committee and they are being accepted by the Chairman of the Select Committee without consulting its members. That means to say he has been throwing overboard the members of the Select Committee who participated because the Chairman and the members worked as a team and came to certain conclusions that are to be found in the Report. Now, the Chairman of the Select Committee thinks it fit to accept amendments tabled by other members with which I may agree or may not agree or other members of the Select Committee may not agree. There is a convention that members of the Select Committee should not take part in the Debate; I should not take part. If the amendment is accepted by the Minister for Education it will be creating an embarrassing position. I want to know whether the Minister accepts it in his individual capacity or as the Chairman of the Select Committee or as the member of the Government. The most appropriate course would have bren for the Minister to have brought these amendments before the Select Committee once again so that we could have considered them on their merits. Even now I suggest very seriously that all the amendments that are sought to be moved here are brought before the Select Committee. There are series of amendments that seek to make fundamental changes. For instance, this amendment of Sri Puttaswamy wants to exclude all Government and University employees from elections. On the other hand the Select Committee stated that those who

were in Government service could also stand for election; there is a fundamental difference in the ideology.

Sir, I must point out, the Senate is not a political body. It is purely an expert body. There we are not concerned with officials or non-officials. What we need is people with talent, educational talent and people who can give sound and sane advice. I therefore suggest that all these amendments must again be sent before the Joint Select Committee for its consideration and adoption or otherwise. If they are accepted here, I must say that they are treating the recommendations of the Select Committee with scant courtesy and Government will not be doing any justice to the members of the Select Committee and the Education Minister would be throwing them overboard.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, my Hon'ble friend raised a point of procedure. A Select Committee is appointed for certain purpose and the moment it submits its report, the function of the Committee is over and the Chairman and the members are free except to the extent of not tabling amendments themselves. As regards other members, they are absolutely free to table any amendment they like. All the amendments have emanated from them and if the Hon'ble Member has any idea that the Government is behind it, he is mistaken. Therefore, Sir, the amendments will have to be judged on merits and the House is at liberty to come to any decision in the matter. At this stage to argue to recommit it to the Select Committee would not be proper for two reasons. Firstly, it is the members who are exercising their rights and they have got to be allowed; secondly, we have no time and we have to make the University autonomous and enable the University to get the grants from bodies who are offering them. My submission is that my Hon'ble friend need not press for recommitment to the Select Committee but discuss it here in all its aspects so that we may come to decision.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Now, Sir, though I was a member of the Select Committee, it is open to me to oppose this amendment and I oppose the amendment moved by Sri K. Puttaswamy. Sir, the Select Committee which was presided over by the Minister in charge of the Bill, went through the various aspects carefully and after series of sittings we made these recommendations including this clause which permits Government servants also to contest in the elections from the Registered Graduates' Constituency. This practice is in vogue not now but from the beginning—ever since the University came into existence. This system has worked very well and I do not think it has created any dissatisfaction. Sir, it must be regarded that the Senate or any other connected body will not be a political body; there is very little politics. If politics is introduced, then the University matters will be in chaos. Now, my friend wants the election to be kept open only to non-officials. This would amount to discrimination between those that are in service and those that are not in service. If it is a question of electing to Legislature which runs the Government, then I can understand disqualifying Government servants. University is an autonomous body in which all are interested. Everybody is interested in the welfare and in the studies of his children. Therefore, there should be no discrimination such as this. Moreover, when we say that only non-officials must be there, it means introducing certain amount of politics into the University; this is very bad. To sum up, Sir, firstly this clause has been considered by the Select Committee and accepted by the Chairman; secondly this practice is in vogue from a very long time and it has worked well; thirdly by accepting the amendment, we will be discriminating between Government servants and non-Government servants and introducing politics into the University bodies which we ought not to do. On these grounds I oppose this amendment. I am sure the Chairman of the Joint Select Committee would not do anything without consulting the members of the Joint Select Committee on this point.

4-30 P.M.

*Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—I do not know why a member of the Select Committee was provoked by this amendment which probably is innocuous and also does not import any political colour whatsoever. One of the prominent members of the Select Committee stated that once the Select Committee report was placed, the convention is that no amendment should be moved. I am afraid to that extent he is trying to cut the sovereign rights of this House. Nowhere it is stated that after the report of the Select Committee, there could be no lacuna whatsoever, in the report, nor is there any convention that no amendment should be moved after the report is presented by the Select Committee. I am afraid to see that in such a matter the Leader of the Opposition is bringing in precedents. I have knowledge of reports being considered and some amendments were accepted by this House even after the report of the Select Committee. As such, there is no harm in discussing this amendment and accepting it if it is acceptable to the whole House. I was rather wondering as to how he could presume that all the Members of the Select Committee would not err. If it is to be presumed that the report of the Select Committee should be accepted in to to, I believe it would be unnecessary for this House to consider it at all. I believe this House has got the right to undo any wrong even though the report has come out of the Select Committee. I do not know why a member of the Select Committee should get offended by this amendment. I remember that a ruling was given in the old Legislative Council when a member of the Select Committee tried to change the mind when the Bill was discussed in the Council. Therefore, I feel so far as the amendment, is concerned it is within the precincts of four walls of democratic principles and as such I support this amendment.

It is said that the University Senate should not be precluded for the government officials. Personally I feel, because there are other elements who are in the Senate and are represented otherwise in their official capacity, they should be precluded from the Senate and is thrown open to non-official elements. As such there is no political colour whatsoever. I personally know some of the members of the Government who contested, and to what an extent of embarrassment they were put to. Therefore it is quite natural that they should be precluded. I submit that this amendment is in order and be accepted without any opposition.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I entirely disagree with Sri Mohamed Imam. I do not know why he imported so much of heat into the discussion. He seems to feel that this amendment is specifically brought for the purpose of getting into Senate only politicians. He is entirely wrong. Are there not non-officials who are not politicians ? As Dr. Reddy has remarked we want all types of men.

> "The Senate should be the meeting ground of the various elements of interests and different types of experiences which constitute the woof and web of the society. Educationists, administrators, agriculturistss, businessmen, commercial men, men from the learned professions and even men in humble ranks—all these will have to find a place there—all brought together and converted into one unit of workers. . . ."

He stated that politicians should not be there. But here in the constitution of the Senate under this new Act there is a great deal of overloading on the other side. Government have ample powers to appoint persons as *ex-officio* members. Therefore there is only a limited scope for elective element. Even there, having regard to the number of registered graduates who are among the ranks of the Government servants, you will find hardly any scope for them to go away. Therefore if their services are needed let the Chancellor nominate. Therefore this amendment is brought forward.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I oppose this amendment for the following reasons.

If this amendment is accepted, it will be denying a right to the teaching staff, to the members of the government and such of the teaching staff who are engaged in the affiliated colleges. It is a right which is enjoyed by the employees of Government and also the teaching staff of the university under the present Act. It is a right which is being enjoyed by the teaching staff in other universities, and they have gone further and have elected some members of the staff to the Parliament and to the Legislative Assemblies. Whereas in Mysore that right has not been extended. Even the right to contest for Senate which has been in vogue under the present Act is going to be curtailed if this amendment is accepted. I therefore vehemently oppose this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'ble Minister say ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—My Hon'ble friend has not correctly reported the discussions in the Select Committee and which is not a proper thing to do. The transactions of a Select Committee are of confidential nature and in referring to them, he was not correct. The principles involved here were discussed at very great length. There were two things ; one is to avoid politics and another to avoid implanting subordinates in authorities wielding power. These were two principles that were discussed, and it was felt that it should be provided not here but in the Service Code. But my Hon'ble friend just now pointed out an instance where a subordinate of the university has come to occupy a place of power and authority, which I believe the House does not accept. Therefore to safeguard ourselves, I believe we must make haste to rectify the error and I therefore accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That at the end of item (*a*), the following words, namely :

"who are not employees of the Government, University or any affiliated College"'

shall be added.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda :

Mr. J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I submitted to the Chair and I seek a ruling on that point : can a Member of the Select Committee go against the recommendations of the Select Committee and offer different views ? Because the same question was raised in the Parliament, subject to correction, where I think the Speaker has given a ruling that no member of the Select Committee can table an amendment and differ from the recommendations of the Select Committee unless he has given a note of dissent. I know even the Hon'ble Minister Sri Ramachandra Rao was a Member of the Select Committee. Can he take a different view from the decisions arrived at by the Select Committee and oppose the recommendation unanimously made by the Select Committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I may bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble House that the very purpose of discussing this report of the Select Committee is to make such changes as the House desires. Even while moving amendments to the clauses, it is left to the Government to accept them or not. Government may feel the necessity to make some changes after the Select Committee stage or any member of the Select Committee can be convinced of the purpose or the utility of amending certain clauses. It is left to the Government to accept or reject it. So far as I can understand, Government or the Member of the Select Committee can exercise the privilege of proposing amendments to the clauses even after the Bill emerges from the Select Committee. The purpose of discussing this Bill is to make such changes as are desired by this House. Any member of the House including the members of the Select Committee, can either oppose or support the amend-

(MR. SPEAKER.)

ment. So far as I remember with respect to the question raised in Parliament which was referred to by Sri Imam, I think, subject to correction, that the ruling given was to the effect that the members of the Select Committee will not oppose the Bill, or oppose the clauses that have been approved, unless a particular member has sent a dissenting minute. Even though I have given a ruling to this effect, if a member feels that a particular clause is wrong, he can go to the extent of saying that it is so and improving that particular clause.

Sri Thimmappa Gowda may now move his amendment.

Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA (Arkalgud).—Sir, I beg to move;

> 'That the words and figures "CLASS I," "CLASS II" and "CLASS III" shall be deleted.'

This is only a formal amendment, very simple and of a verbal nature. It seeks to delete the words Class I, Class II and Class III.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

> 'That the words and figures "CLASS I," "CLASS II" and "CLASS III" shall be deleted.'

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I oppose this amendment. This classification we had with some purpose. The Minister was also referring to this. For example, class I persons will come only as experts. Elected members will come under class II and class III will be nominated members. There is nothing derogatory. In this connection I may just mention an anecdote. There was a proprietor of a bus and passengers were admitted under three classifications, 1, 2, and 3 and fares were different. But the passengers could sit anywhere in the bus. One passenger wondered as to why there is difference in fare though they were not supplied with different seats. In the course of the journey the bus went out of order and was held up on the way. The conductor cried out, first class passengers, please stay in the Bus, second class passengers, please get down and walk and third class passengers will please get down and push the vehicle.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore you are supporting the amendment?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I want to be true to the Select Committee which came to the unanimous understanding just to distinguish official members like the Vice-Chancellor, Director of Agriculture, who can be there by virtue of the position. That was why they were put in as Class I. We did this with some purpose and motive.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, we are going towards a classless society and the classifications suggested in the clause is not actually necessary. The original idea was to put in *ex-officio* members as class I and elected Members as Class II and nominated members as class III. The Hon'ble Mover of the amendment agrees with the clause but wants only the words Class I, Class II and Class III to be deleted and he wants to retain the classification as *ex-officio*, elected and nominated members. That will serve the purpose of classification. Personally, I have no objection to the removal of the words.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> "That the words and figures Class I Class II and Class III shall be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I am not moving my amendment to clause 15, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will then put the clause. The question is:

> "That Clause 15 as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 15 as amended, was added to this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no amendments to clauses 16, 17 and 18, The question is :

"That Clauses 16, 17 and 18 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 16, 17 and 18 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to clause 19.

*Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I move the following amendment to clause 19 (1) (*d*) :—

'(1) At the end of the item (*d*), the following words, namely, "who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any affiliated College" shall be added.'

Sir, in the existing Act of the Mysore University of 1933, the election of Council Members from the Senate are confined to persons who are not on the staff of the University. It is omitted in the report of the Select Committee. The result would be that all persons who are members of the Senate are eligible for election. If we look at the constitution of the Senate, we find that it is loaded with officials in the sense that members of the University in their *ex-officio* capacity are there. If elections to the Syndicate from the Senate are thrown open to them, it is very likely that these elements will get elected; that is one thing. Another thing is, the object of this Act of 1933 was to give representation to the non-official elements on the Syndicate. Now, according to the report there is very little chance for the non-officials to get themselves elected to the Senate. There is another thing, Sir. Even according to the proposed constitution of the Syndicate, there are the Vice-Chancellor, Director of Public Instruction, four Principals of the Colleges and one person to be elected by the Academic Council. There will be seven persons belonging to the teaching staff. Therefore, Sir, it is very reasonable that the other elements have a representation on the Syndicate. I am certain that the Leader of the Opposition Sri Imam would repeat his arguments and objections as he did when I moved an amendment to clause 15. I am confident that this amendment would be accepted by the House and thus ensure non-official element being on this Syndicate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

'(1) At the end of the item (*d*), the following words, namely, "who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any Affiliated College" shall be added.'

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I support the amendment, Sir. This amendment is a little different from the one which was accepted by this House a little while ago. There, it was election to the Senate and here it is to the Syndicate. As has already been pointed out and as could also be seen in section 19, the official element is over-riding. It is but right that the non-officials should have proper representation in the Syndicate.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I oppose the amendment. Government have already accepted an amendment disqualifying the officers of the University from being chosen to the Senate. This sub-clause (*d*) related to election amongst the members of the Senate. So, when the Government have already accepted the amendment in respect of disqualifying the employees of the University and once the members of the Senate are elected, amongst the members of the Senate no such discrimination could be allowed, and the type of election that is contemplated under this clause is proportionate representation. Therefore, I believe this amendment will not be in tune.

Sri. A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, my friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has oversimplified the matter. I wish to invite his attention to rule of composition of the Senate. Apart from the elected members, it consist mostly of Professors and University staff. Also there will be nine nominated persons who may be from the University itself. To allow them to participate in the elections would amount to shutting out

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.) the non-official element—that is the point Sri Puttaswamy was driving at. I believe, in conformity of what we have done in clause 15 (2), this will have to be accepted as a matter of course. I accept it.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That at the end of the item (*d*), the following words, namely, "who are not the employees of the Government, the University or any Affiliated College" shall be added.'

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 19, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 19, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—For clauses 20 to 25 there are no amendments. The question is:

"That Clauses 20 to 25, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 20 to 25, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 26. There are two amendments tabled—one by Sri K. Puttaswamy and another by Sri T. Mariappa. Though Sri Puttaswamy's amendment has been received earlier, the amendment tabled by Sri Mariappa, if accepted, will overshadow Sri Puttaswamy's amendment.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I will not move my amendment, Sir.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—May I, Sir, with your permission bring to your notice that there is a very anomalous position under clause 21? Having abolished the class distinction under clause 15, in the Senate, nobody has sent an amendment to clause 21 with regard to Class 1, 2, 3 in the Academic Council. I do not know why Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda and Sri Puttaswamy did not think of it.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is left to the Chair, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am placed in a very difficult position. Unless there are consequential amendments. . . . . .

SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—It is not consequential amendment. The position is very clear. You have put to vote clauses 20 to 25 and they stand. Now we are at clause 26.

MR. SPEAKER.—Unless there is a consequential amendment, the House cannot reconsider it. If, at the proper moment, this matter had been brought to my notice, I would have allowed to bring verbal amendments. Now that stage had passed.

5 P. M.

SRI T. MARIAPPA.—Clause 26. I beg to move:

'For the existing clause the following new clause shall be substituted *viz.*, :—

"*26 The Board of Appointments.*—(1) Appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with rules made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Syndicate; and for the purpose of making such appointments there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and two other members appointed by the Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor shall *ex-officio* be the Chairman of the Board and the other two members shall have such qualifications as the Chancellor may, by rules prescribe. The Registrar shall *ex-officio* be the Secretary to the Board.

(2) The Board shall make appointments of:

(*a*) Professors and Readers for any subject in consultation with two specialists in the subject concerned selected from outside the University by the Chancellor;

(*b*) Lecturers for any subject in consultation with—

(*i*) The Principal, Central College, Bangalore, when an appointment for Science subjects is made, or

the Principal Maharaja's College, Mysore, when an appointment for Arts subjects is to be made, or the Principal of the Professional College concerned, or when there are more than one such college, the seniormost of the Principals of such Colleges, when an appointment for professional subjects is to be made ;

(*ii*) the Dean of the Faculty concerned when an appointment for the subject pertaining to that faculty is to be made ; and

(*iii*) the Head of the Department for the subject concerned when an appointment for that subject is made.

(3) Save as otherwise provided in this Act, the Chairman of the Board shall be competent to make appointments of ministerial and other staff in accordance with rules made by the Syndicate.

(4) The decisions of the Board, and in such cases as may be prescribed by the Chancellor, the decisions of the Chairman of the Board, shall not have effect unless approved by the Chancellor ; thereafter, every such decision shall be final and shall not be called in question in any manner."

During the general discussions on the report of the Select Committee some Hon'ble members expressed the opinion that the Board of Appointments should be made as far as possible independent of any influence and that they must be free to make selections unhampered by any considerations. With this view, this amendment has been brought. In this amendment no major change is made except the appointment of two independent members to the Board of Appointments. In all other aspects we have retained the principle of consultation with particular Heads of Departments. I particularly want the Hon'ble Members to know the desirability of having the Board of Appointments to be entirely free, so that they can make appointments in an impartial manner. Some members perhaps may import the idea that this is to provide posts to some non-officials. But I may say that I want these posts to be filled by men who would not yield to any corrupting influence and by men who have experience and men of very high character and attainments. Only with this end in view that we want the Board of Appointments to contain two really very eminent men and not because that we suspect anything with regard to the arrangement made in the existing clause. When the university is independent, we want men of independent views so that they can make appointments in an impartial manner. I am not casting any aspersions when I observe that the history of appointments in recent years has not been very complimentary. Therefore, when we want the University to be autonomous and thrive well, we must have a good selection of staff consisting of men of integrity, character and above all corruption. Therefore with these few words I commend this amendment for the acceptance of this House.

With regard to sub-clauses 3 and 4, they are exactly the same as in clause 26. I hope this explanation will suffice to bring home the need for having two impartial men on this Board and men who have got real attainments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"For the existing clause, the following new clause shall be substituted, namely :—

"26. *The Board of Appointments.*—(1) Appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with rules made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Syndicate; and for the purpose of making such appointments there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and two other members appointed by the Chancellor. The Vice-Chancellor shall *ex-officio* be the Chairman of the Board and the other two members shall have such qualifications as the Chancellor may, by rules prescribe. The Registrar shall *ex-officio* be the Secretary to the Board.

(MR. SPEAKER.)

(2) The Board shall make appointments of—

(*a*) Professors and Readers for any subject in consultation with two specialists in the subject concerned selected from outside the University by the Chancellor ;

(*b*) Lecturers for any subject in consultation with—

(*i*) The Principal, Central College, Bangalore, when an appointment for Science subjects is made, or the Principal, Maharaja's College, Mysore, when an appointment for Arts subjects is to be made, or the Principal of the Professional College concerned, or when there are more than one such College, the senior-most of the Principals of such Colleges, when an appointment for professional subjects is to be made ;

(*ii*) the Dean of the Faculty concerned when an appointment for the subject pertaining to that faculty is to be made ; and

(*iii*) the Head of the Department for the subject concerned when an appointment for that subject is made.

(3) Save as otherwise provided in this Act, the Chairman of the Board shall be competent to make appointments of ministerial and other staff in accordance with rules made by the Syndicate.

(4) The decisions of the Board, and in such cases as may be prescribed by the Chancellor, the decisions of the Chairman of the Board, shall not have effect unless approved by the Chancellor ; thereafter, every such decision shall be final and not be called in question in any manner."

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I oppose this amendment in all seriousness. It looks that the intentions of Sri Mariappa is very laudable. But the method of execution he has proposed is highly objectionable. He says selections should be impartial, independent and free from influences. But the amendments which he has tabled are such that it will take away the powers of the Syndicate and all the powers will be vested in the Government through the Chancellor, of course. I do not know the system of appointments that is adopted in other universities and I want some time to study them. I am sure Sri Bheemappa Naik will enlighten us about this matter. I think they have the Vice-Chancellor and Principals of some colleges and various Deans who are proficient in their respective spheres and their recommendations are more or less finally accepted.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—This is stipulated only in Mysore. In other cases it is only the Syndicate that does the appointments. Here, we do not want any interference from anybody and therefore we have provided for the Vice-Chancellor and two other members permanently appointed and there will be still the Principals, Deans and Specialists.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I stated in my speech when the Bill was taken into consideration that the University has got into disrepute on account of various irregularities and scandals that have arisen in connection with the appointments made. I also stated at that time that discontentment is rampant because favouritism and nepotism have been the practice. So I suggested at that time that this power of appointment should be taken away as far as possible from the Syndicate because undue influences and recommendations play a prominent part. I must also mention that though the ultimate power is vested with the Government, the Government also has to be blamed in many cases. It often happened that the Government was also subjected to many influences and if you want me, I will give instances where Government have been misled by recommendations and instances wherein seniority has been overlooked and where Lecturers have gone over their Assistant Professors. So, to take away this power from the Syndicate, the Government finds its own difficulties. So our idea was to have an

independent and expert body which will make appointments based on merit and seniority. It is with that idea that it was contemplated to have two more experts from outside to serve on the Board of Appointments.

The opinion of these experts was mandatory. But according to the amendment, you say "in consultation with them." There lies the difficulty. These amendments will have the effect of concentrating all the powers in the hands of Government. You have deprived the Syndicate of its powers and you have deprived the Appointment Board of its powers. If we accept this amendment, all the powers of appointment become vested in the Government.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Government does not come into the picture. It is only the Vice-Chancellor and two others.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Chancellor is Governor and he is a constitutional Chancellor and before acting, he has to consult the Cabinet and the Governor will not take an independent decision. The appointments to the University shall be in accordance with the rules made by the Chancellor. Chancellor will be the Governor and the Governor will be a constitutional Governor. The amendment says:

> "The appointments to the teaching staff of the University shall be made in accordance with the rules made by the Chancellor in consultation with the Syndicate; and for the purpose of making such appointments, there shall be a Board of Appointments consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and two other members appointed by the Chancellor."

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—All the five lines of the Select Committee are retained.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—There must be statutory provision. It should not be in the hands of the Government. That was what was provided in the original Act. But now the amendment says that the Board of Appointments shall consist of the Vice-Chancellor and two persons who will be appointed by the Chancellor. Naturally these two persons will be Government nominees and they will not be independent.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, can you tell me whether the subordinates to the Vice-Chancellor will be free to express their opinion in the Board. That is what Sri Mascarenhas expressed. How can subordinates to the Vice-Chancellor express their views?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I do not want Government to have anything to do with appointments. If it comes to that, they may exercise their powers in their visitorial capacity. What is the qualification of such Member? The qualification may be a person who has gone to jail or a politician. What is the qualification that will be prescribed for these two persons?

> "The Vice-Chancellor shall *ex-officio* be the Chairman of the Board and the other two members shall have such qualifications as the Chancellor may, by rules prescribe."

Sir, on the other hand, we had prescribed qualifications saying that he must be a Dean, he must be a Principal . . .

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—All these persons will be subordinates to the Vice-Chancellor and they dare not go against the views of the Vice-Chancellor.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, this Board will entirely be a creature of the Government which I do not want. it to be. I was associated with the Syndicate. They used to appoint an Appointment Committee. To that Committee, invariably we used to get two experts from outside, persons who were free from official influence and who could give their independent opinion and their opinion would always prevail and they were always given due respect. Sir, here also we may include two specialists in the Appointment Board. In the amendment, it is said that they come here and offer their views. It may be accepted or it may not be accepted. The phrase: "in consultation with two specialists" does not serve any purpose. Let us go back to the old method of entrusting it to

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

the Syndicate. You are making it worse here. All the powers vest in the Government and the two experts will be mere toys. Even the qualification of these two persons have to be prescribed by the Government. Moreover, this will be a consulting authority. Our view was that all appointments in the University must be based on merit and seniority so that our standards will increase. But if you have this amendment, University matters will go to dogs. Appointment will be purely by Government nomination. No expert will come there and give advice when he knows that it is only consultative and nothing else. On this ground, I vehemently oppose the amendment. Even the Law Minister who is in charge of this Bill and who knows what is happening, knows that we came to this decision after mature consideration. He was a party to this and now he has thrown overboard the decision of the Select Committee. This will not be complimentary to the Minister who has presided over the Select Committee and who now accepts the amendment tabled. I am sorry, I cannot compliment the Hon'ble Minister at all. I can say that he has gone back on settled things and has submitted himself to the party mandates. He is not doing his duty. Even now, it is not too late. Let the Committee consider it. Let us consider the pros and cons and let us come to an understanding. To take us by surprise and concentrate all the powers of appointment in the Government is really highly derogatory and it is not fair either to the University or to the Select Committee which considered this Bill.

I therefore oppose it Sir.

SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—*Sir, I agree with Sri Imam that this particular clause raises very important issues. Before the House votes upon it, I want to say a few words as I know the feeling on this side of the House particularly. I know the destiny of this clause also. Nevertheless I want certain aspects of the matter to be considered. There is no doubt that there is a great deal of force in the apprehensions of Sri Imam. Though it appears very rosy and very acceptable and very endearing, when one looks at the language of the clause and this amendment, the way in which it can be implemented, raises justifiable apprehensions. If the Government means and if those powers-that-be in charge of this particular set-up will mean it to do in the best manner possible, it is possible that this clause itself can be taken and converted to the best advantage. I grant it. But what we are also considering is this. So far as the Bill is concerned, I must make this observation without meaning any reflection on anybody that we are laying down the law as it were stipulating the particular approach to a particular matter. The approach that we should give should be sufficiently long range so that the apprehensions that are entertained and given expression to by Sri Imam may ultimately prove illusory. That should be the real approach. Here is a certain provision which says that the Vice-Chancellor assisted by two Members shall be the deciding factor so far as appointments are concerned.

It is also said that qualifications would be prescribed. Human nature being what it is, let us think a while and try to forecast as to what would be the possible qualifications that you might prescribe in a case of this kind such as to meet the justifiable apprehensions of my friend Sri Imam and a large number of people who might likewise feel as he has done. Sir, in that view of the matter, I would like to have a clarification from the Hon'ble Minister. I know Sri Mariappa has moved this with the best of intentions. Let him not think that we are reading something into it when he is bringing an amendment. I ask the Hon'ble Minister through you, Sir, what is exactly at the back of his mind ? Academicians', usual function it is to really determine the qualifications and the ability and the capability of a particular person to a particular post and they have a determining voice there. So far we mean that the University must have the academic freedom which is the most

important merit that we may claim for this Bill. Here is a case where a distinction is made in three different terms —certain academic matters, certain administrative matters and certain financial matters. In that view of the matter, I ask the Hon'ble Minister whether it commends itself to him. So far as that academic freedom which is the most important thing in respect of which we can make a justifiable claim is concerned, whether he is not allowing inroads into it Now? Sri Mariappa, the Hon'ble Member from Mysore City while sponsoring this amendment and while meeting the remarks made by the Minister was very particular to make out a case like this. He said, the Vice-Chancellor with his subordinates, namely, the Deans and is going to dispose of the matter. I perfectly grant it. The composition as envisaged in this Bill is like that. I do not make any apology for that. It is with eyes wide open that we have made this suggestion in the Select Committee. Is there any going away from that view, particularly due to the fears that you entertain so far as the composition is concerned? That is what I want Sri Mariappa to consider. There you have two persons to dispose of the matter where the academicians have an over-riding and supreme voice in the selection of the persons for the appointments. Here is a case where they can say that it has been done 'in consultation with them'. But they will not have a voting right; they will not be a deciding factor. Sir, I will bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister that this has raised another important question. There is a feeling in the country that an attempt is being made by politicians to over-step the teachers' right. You might remember, so many Teachers' Associations and important bodies throughout the length and breadth of India have been saying that an attempt is being made by politicians to over-step their rights. The teacher has done his best; he has been patriotic in spite of the meagre wherewithals, in spite of his handicaps. Here is a teacher who is giving his best to the country and bringing up a new generation as it were. With all that, there is a feeling amongst the teachers that slowly and surely and in a very substantial measure, there is an attempt made by the politicians to take charge of this important domain also and try to dislodge the teacher from his just, rightful and legitimate place. It may affect the self-esteem of the politician. Being myself a politician, it will certainly wound my self-esteem. But, I personally see the fears and apprehensions of the teachers as an entire class. Sir, I do not want to add anything more. With great regret, I am making this submission because it looks to me that this will have its easy passage. Not that I am reflecting upon this House; the House is entitled to register its will. I bow my head in perfect obedience to the will of the House. But still I want the House to consider, particularly the Hon'ble Education Minister to consider, whether he is really making a change. Except one argument that the Deans and other subordinates of the Vice-Chancellor are going to be there, absolutely no other substantial ground has been made out before this House by the sponsors of the amendment to make up our minds to support this amendment. I know my friend Sri Bheemappa Naik is preparing himself.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Not preparing, but I wanted certain clarification; that is all. The Public Service Commission is appointed by the Government. Every appointment is being made by the Government. Merely because the Government appoints, does it mean to say that the Public Service Commission is not independent? Does it not consider cases and recommend? To say so would mean casting aspersions on the two persons who are to be appointed by the Chancellor. It would amount to say that these persons would be partial and they will not safeguard the interest of the country, and persons with voting right alone would safeguard the interest of the country and not others. Have you at any time said to do away with the Public Service Commission and allow the Revenue Commissioner to make appointments in his department and the Chief

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

Engineer to make appointments in his department and so on ?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN —Sir, nothing surprises me more than what my friend has stated. I have not come to discuss the merits or the demerits of the proposed two persons at all.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is far way my mind ; in fact no politician should be appointed.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have not come to that aspect. I can only say the charge is there that in the matter of reform of education in the country either here or elsewhere, at any rate, suspicions are there that on attempt is seriously and substantially being made by the politicians to override the teacher and dislodge him from his legitimate place. That is the charge that I am referring to and I can certainly maintain this charge. That charge is there and it has been made very often. As a matter of fact, a number of conferences have been held in every part of the country, the North, the South, the East and the West and this charge is made and every teacher is aghast that the politician is making this attempt. In that background I made this submission. In fact, I made a submission that it is possible to work this in a good spirit. I have paid compliments to my friend Sri Mariappa; I do not know why he disowns it. I said that this could be worked in good spirit. But, there is again that possibility of nullifying the real effect that is sought to be brought out. I paid good compliments to Sri Mariappa; I do not know why his champion Sri Bheemappa Naik stood up to destroy the very element. Sir, the charge that was raised is that the Vice-Chancellor with his subordinates, with Deans and Principals, sits there and makes appointments. I was stating there is

5-30 P.M.

nothing wrong in it. We seem to have taken an important role so far as the freedom of the university is concerned. In regard to the composition of the Board of Appointments, when you want to change the composition, I want to know what is the academic autonomy that you want to give ? Academic freedom is in a way, in my humble opinion, sought to be made illusory. The second thing that I want to know is, supposing we take all these together and make appointment ; is there not the possibility that it can be abused ? In fact an assurance may be given by a party in power who feel their place is permanent. But I say, when we are going to lay down law, your assurance or suggestions of any kind on the floor of the House, is not correct.

The Second aspect that I want to make clear is, no doubt appointments are to be made. My friend Sri Bheemappa Naik put a very pertinent question ; are you going to allow that these appointments should be made by departmental men ? I feel that this should not happen. But are you going to ensure it here ? Therefore I suggest. . . . .

Sri. T. MARIAPPA.—That can be ensured.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—There is also another danger. In the amendment, as it is, there is no fixity of tenure. When the world is changing, and when times are changing, is it fair to import trade-unionism into the University atmosphere ? How long do you want these people to continue ? As it is worded here, they may continue so long as the Sun and the Moon are there in the world. Therefore we have to think about these in order to create official functionaries. Perhaps when Sri Mariappa suggests this amendment, he has in his mind that these two persons should be eminent men and they must be whole-time officers. That may be his idea. That will be virtually another Public Service Commission to the University. If that is your idea, say so. Let us be clear about all this.

Personally speaking, though I am a member of the Select Committee, I do not agree with Sri Imam. If really the whole House feels otherwise of the report, we cannot stand in their way.

I want to appeal to the Education Minister to pause a while. There must be an assurance to the academicians that there is no idea of taking over anything which are their legitimate share. On the other hand it should

not also be a duplication of Public Service Commission. I want to request the Hon'ble Minister to pause a little more and consider this clause and say that it will not be a Public Service Commission only for appointments to University. As it is, there is a Public Service Commission for the entire State and you want a Sub-Public Service Commission for the University because everything is the same here. If one is to read the several provisions of this Bill, this is only a replica in moderate and modernised form. Therefore I suggest that this is too dangerous a thing. I therefore request that instead of forcing the hands of the Hon'ble Minister, let us allow him to pause a little further and decide this. If even then this amendment is in the interest of the country, by all means let us accept it. After all the sovereignty of the House is supreme and if shall reign supreme.

*Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—With regard to the amendment of Sri Mariappa, after the discussion we have heard, it has cast a good deal of doubt in our minds and the debate seems to have centred round a very important issue which seems to be deviating fundamentally from the recommendations made by the Select Committee. Some members of the Select Committee seem to have taken a severe objection to this amendment. Anyway I honestly feel that we should ponder over this amendment for some more time. Such being the issue we cannot at once make up our minds either to reject or to support the amendment that is introduced just now. So this amendment in particular may be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'be Minister say ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We will take it up tomorrow. One thing I wish to bring to the notice of this House is, as the Hon'ble Members know, this is a very important measure to enable the University to get adequate funds. There is a very short period before us. This has also to be approved by the Legislative Council. Even so, the point raised by Sri Mohamed Imam and others is so important that we will have to bestow some more thought over it and express our views. Meanwhile, would it not be better to finish other clauses ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Tomorrow we have on the list of business, discussion of Report of the Public Accounts Committee. Therefore we will dispose of other clauses now and reserve only Clause 26 for tomorrow.

There is no amendment to clauses 27 to 36.

The question is:

"That Clauses 27 to 36 both inclusive stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 27 to 36 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 37. There is an amendment to clause 37 by Sri Srinivasa Iyengar.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment :

'That the existing clause be renumbered as sub-clause (1) and the following be added as sub-clause (2), namely :

"(2) the Government shall as soon as the annual accounts as described in sub-clause (1) are received, present the same to the Legislature." '

I have already dealt with this matter in the course of my remarks on the consideration motion. I believe there will be no objection to accept it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'That the existing clause be renumbered as sub-clause (1) and the following be added as sub-clause (2), namely :

"(2) the Government shall as soon as the annual accounts as described in sub-clause (1) are received, present the same to the Legislature." '

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I accept the amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That Clause 37 be re-numbered as sub-clause (1) and the following be added as sub-clause (2) namely:

"(2) The Government shall as soon as the annual accounts as described in the sub-clause (1) are received present the same to the Legislature." '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 37 as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 37, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no amendments up to clause 45. I will put them.

The question is:

"That Clauses 38 to 44, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 38 to 44, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 45.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I do not move my amendment to sub-clause (1). I will move the amendment to sub-clause (2), Sir. I beg to move:

"That in clause 45, in the second proviso, for the word 'six', the word 'nine' shall be substituted."

I have already dealt with this aspect in the course of my observations on the consideration motion. This correction is very necessary and purely consequential. Instead of the word 'six', it must be 'nine.' I believe there is no need for me to dilate on this. It is a correction of a consequential nature.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I accept the amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in sub-clause (2) in the second proviso for the word 'six', the word 'nine' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 45, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 45, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 46, There is an amendment.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment;

'That in Clause 46, the words "two-thirds of the members present and voting", may be substituted by the words "two-thirds of the total strength of the senate";

'That Clause 46 may be renumberd as sub-clause (1) and the following be added as sub-clause (2), namely:

"An appeal shall lie to the Chancellor on the resolution of the Senate in respect of the removal of any person from the register of graduates within thirty days from the date of receipt of such resolution by the person and the decision of the Chancellor shall be final." '

Sir, the clause as at present drafted reads as follows:

"46. Removal from membership of the University—The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, remove by a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting, the name of any person from the register of graduates, and remove any person from the membership of any authority of the University if he has been convicted by a court of an offence which in the opinion of the Senate, iuvolves moral turpitude or if he has been guilty of gross misconduct unworthy of a member of the University, and for the same reasons may withdraw any distinction, degree, diploma or privilege conferred or granted by the University."

In this clause there are two parts. One the Senate has been given the power to remove the name of a person from the list of registered graduates without assigning any reason. Further the authority that is required according to this clause is two-thirds of the members present and voting. The quorum for the Senate meeting is two-fifths of the total number of members. If the strength of the Senate is 60 and to the quorum of two-fifths of that number and if two-thirds of the number of members present, which comes to about 18 (2/3 of 24) - if 18 members present say that the name should be struck off the rolls, it should not happen. I therefore move the amendment that for the members present and voting, two-thirds of the total strength of the Senate may be substituted.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—This is a penal provision and I believe the safeguard suggested by the Hon'ble Member may be accepted. I accept it Sir.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—And then for the same clause, I have sought to introduce an appellate authority on the action of the Senate. That is why I have suggested that the existing clause 46 may be renumbered as sub-clause (1) and the following new sub-clause (2) shall be inserted, namely:

"(2) An appeal shall lie to the Chancellor on the resolution of the Senate in respect of the removal of any person from the register of graduates within thirty days from the date of receipt of such resolution by the person and the decision of the Chancellor shall be final."

Clause 46 relates to two matters. One is the removal of any person from the membership of any authority of the University and the other is removal of any person from the register of graduates. I have brought this amendment in respect of the registered graduates whose names are liable to be removed under this clause.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'(1) For the words "themembers present and voting" the words "the total strength of the Senate" shall be substituted.

(2) The existing clause 46 shall be re-numbered as sub-clause (1) and the following new sub-clause (2) shall be inserted, namely—

"(2) An appeal shall lie to the Chancellor on the resolution of the Senate in respect of the removal of any person from the register of graduates within thirty days from the date of receipt of such resolution by the person and the decision of the Chancellor shall be final."

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I consider the safeguard as necessary and I accept it, Sir.

There is one verbal amendment which is necessary. In view of the amendment proposed by Sri Srinivasa Iyengar:

'For the words "and remove" the words "and also remove" may be substituted.'

That makes proper sense. I move that amendment.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I accept it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will now put the amendment of Sri Srinivasa Iyengar vote:

'That in clause 46, for the words "the members present and voting" the words "the total strength of the Senate" shall be substituted;

'The existing clause 46, shall be renumbered as sub-clause (1) and the following new sub-clause (2), shall be inserted, namely:

"An appeal shall lie to the Chancellor on the resolution of the Senate in respect of the removal of any person from the register of graduates within thirty days from the date of receipt of such resolution by the person and the decision of the Chancellor shall be final."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall now put the amendment suggested by the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill:

The question is:

'That for the words "and remove any person from membership," the words "and also remove any person from membership" may be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 46 as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 46 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no amendments up to clause 59. I shall put them. The question is:

"That Clauses 47 to 58 both inclusive stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 47 to 58 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 59. There is an amendment by Sri K. Puttaswamy and another by Sri T. Mariappa.

***Sri T. MARIAPPA.**—I beg to move:

"For the existing clauses 59 to 62, the following clauses shall be substituted namely—

"59. *Removal af difficulties.*—If any difficulty arises as to the first constitution or appointment of any authority or officer of the University, or otherwise in giving effect to the provisions of this Act, the Chancellor, as occasion may require, may on the request of the Vice-Chancellor by order, do anything which appears to him necessary for the purpose of removing the difficulty:

Provided that the power conferred by this section shall not be exercisable after the expiration of three years from the commencement of this Act."

"60. *Continuance of Statutes, etc.*—(1) The Statutes, Administrative Ordinances and Academic Ordinances framed under the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) and the notice and orders made or issued under the said Act shall, in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, continue to be in force and be deemed to have been made under the provisions of this Act until they are superseded or modified by Statutes, Ordinances, Regulations, Rules, Notices and Orders made by or under the provisions of this Act.

(2) The Colleges and Sections of Colleges referred to in sub-section (2) of section 5 shall continue to be maintained by the University until such date as the Government may, by order, appoint."

"61. *Repeal and Savings.*—(1) As from the date of commencement of this Act, the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) shall stand repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding the repeal of the said Act—

(*i*) any person holding office immediately before the commencement of this Act, as Vice-Chancellor shall, on such commencement, be the Vice-Chancellor of the University and shall continue to hold the said office and to exercise all powers and to perform all duties conferred on the Vice-Chancellor by or under the provisions of this Act, until the new Vice-Chancellor is appointed under this Act;

(*ii*) (a) the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and all other Bodies and Committees of the University other than the University Council, constituted under the said Act and immediately in office before the commencement of this Act shall be deemed to be respectively the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and the Bodies and Committees of the University constituted under the

relevant provisions of this Act and shall, until the date not being later than one year from the date on which this Act comes into force on which the Chancellor declares that the Senate has been duly constituted under this Act, exercise all powers other than the power to elect members to the Syndicate and perform all duties conferred on the authorities, bodies and committees under the said provisions ;

(*b*) if any vacancy occurs in the office of the member of any of the bodies or committees referred to in this clause, it shall not be necessary to fill in the same :

Provided that the Chancellor may nominate any person to fill any such vacancy ;

Provided further that the omission to fill in any such vacancy shall not invalidate any Act or decision of any such body or committee by reason only of the omission to fill in the said vacancy ;

(*iii*) the Chancellor shall appoint the members of the Syndicate and the said body shall exercise all powers and perform all duties conferred on the Syndicate under this Act, until the Syndicate is duly constituted in accordance with the provisions of this Act ;

(*iv*) in all other respects, the provisions of section 6 of the Mysore General Clauses Act, 1899 (Mysore Act III of 1899) shall be applicable.''

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'' For the existing clauses 59 to 62, the following clauses shall be substituted, namely—

'' 59. *Removal of difficulties.*—If any difficulty arises as to the first constitution or appointment of any authority or officer of the University, or otherwise in giving effect to the provisions of this Act, the Chancellor, as occasion may require, may on the request of the Vice-Chancellor by order, do anything which appears to him necessary for the purpose of removing the difficulty :

Provided that the power conferred by this section shall not be exercisable after the expiration of three years from the commencement of this Act.''

'' 60. *Continuance of Statutes, etc.*—(1) The Statutes, Administrative Ordinances and Academic Ordinances framed under the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) and the notice and orders made or issued under the said Act shall, in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, continue to be in force and be deemed to have been made under the provisions of this Act until they are superseded or modified by Statutes, Ordinances. Regulations, Rules, Notices and Orders made by or under the provisions of this Act.

(2) The Colleges and Sections of Colleges referred to in sub-section (2) of section 5 shall continue to be maintained by the University until such date as the Government may, by order, appoint.''

61. *Repeal and savings.*—(1) As from the date of commencment of this Act, the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) shall stand repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding the repeal of the said Act—

(i) any person holding office immediately before the commencement of this Act, as Vice-Chancellor shall, on such commencement, be the Vice-Chancellor of the University and shall continue to hold the said office and to exercise all powers and to perform all duties conferred on the Vice-Chancellor by or under the provisions of this Act, until the new Vice-Chancellor is appointed under this Act ;

(ii) (*a*) the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and all other Bodies and

(MR. SPEAKER.)

Committees of the University other than the University Council constituted under the said Act and immediately in office before the commencement of this Act shall be deemed to be respectively the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and the Bodies and Committees of the University constituted under the relevant provisions of this Act and shall, until the date not being later than one year from the date on which this Act comes into force on which the Chancellor declares that the Senate has been duly constituted under this Act, exercise all powers other than the power to elect members to the Syndicate and perform all duties conferred on the authorities, bodies and committees under the said provisions;

(*b*) if any vacancy occurs in the office of the member of any of the bodies or committees referred to in this clause, it shall not be necessary to fill in the same:

Provided that the Chancellor may nominate any person to fill any such vacancy;

Provided further that the omission to fill in any such vacancy shall not invalidate any Act or decision of any such body or committee by reason only of the omission to fill in the said vacancy;

(iii) the Chancellor shall appoint the members of the Syndicate and the said body shall exercise all powers and perform all duties conferred on the Syndicate under this Act, until Syndicate is duly constituted in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(iv) in all other respects, the provisions of section 6 of the Mysore General Clauses Act, 1899 (Mysore Act III of 1899) shall be applicable."

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I accept the amendments, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'For the existing clauses 59 to 62, the following clauses shall be substituted, namely—

"59. *Removal of difficulties.*—If any difficulty arises as to the first constitution or appointment of any authority or officer of the University, or otherwise in giving effect to the provisions of this Act, the Chancellor, as occasion may require, may on the request of the Vice-Chancellor by order, do anything which appears to him necessary for the purpose of removing the difficulty:

Provided that the power conferred by this section shall not be exercisable after the expiration of three years from the commencement of this Act."

"60. *Continuance of Statutes etc.*—(1) The Statutes, Administrative Ordinances and Academic Ordinances framed under the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) and the notice and orders made or issued under the said Act shall, in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, continue to be in force and be deemed to have been made under the provisions of this Act until they are superseded or modified by Statutes, Ordinances, Regulations, Rules, Notices and Orders made by or under the provisions of this Act.

(2) The Colleges and sections of Colleges referred to in sub-section (2) of section 5 shall continue to be maintained by the University until such date as the Government may, by order, appoint."

"61. *Repeal and savings.*—(1) As from the date of commencement of this Act, the Mysore University Act, 1933 (Mysore Act III of 1933) shall stand repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding the repeal of the said Act—

(i) any person holding office immediately before the commencement of this Act, as Vice-Chancellor shall, on such commencement, be the Vice-Chancellor of the University and shall continue to hold the said office and to exercise all powers and to perform all

duties conferred on the Vice-Chancellor by or under the provisions of this Act, until the new Vice-Chancellor is appointed under this Act ;

(ii) (*a*) the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and all other Bodies and Committees of the University other than the University Council, constituted under the said Act and immediately in office before the commencement of this Act shall be deemed to be respectively the Members of the Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculties and the Bodies and Committees of the University constituted under the relevant provisions of this Act and shall, until the date not being later than one year from the date on which this Act comes into force on which the Chancellor declares that the Senate has been duly constituted under this Act, exercise all powers other than the power to elect members to the Syndicate and perform all duties conferred on the authorities, bodies and committees under the said provisions ;

(*b*) if any vacancy occurs in the office of the member of any of the bodies or committees referred to in this clause, it shall not be necessary to fill in the same :

Provided that the Chancellor may nominate any person to fill any such vacancy ;

Provided further that the omission to fill in any such vacancy shall not invalidate any Act or decision of any such body or committee by reason only of the omission to fill in the said vacancy ;

(iii) the Chancellor shall appoint the members of the Syndicate and the said body shall exercise all powers and perform all duties conferred on the Syndicate under this Act, until the Syndicate is duly constituted in accordance with the provisions of this Act ;

(iv) in all other respects, the provisions of section 6 of the Mysore General Clauses Act, 1899 (Mysore Act III of 1899) shall be applicable." '

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 59 to 62, as amended stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

The Clauses as amended, were added to the Bill.

Discussion will take place tomorrow on clause 26. Now we have got half-an-hour discussion on the agenda.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We may take it up tomorrow, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, it may be taken up tomorrow. The House will now adjourn and meet at 12 tomorrow.

The House adjourned at Fifty-five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet at Twelve of the Clock on Friday, the 19th October 1956.